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Elections, Bylaws, and the International Initiative

Your Board of Directors has been very active over the last few months. As most of you know, the board convenes twice a year, at the spring Annual Meeting and in the fall during the American Anthropological Association Meetings. Our work continues during the year through online discussions. As we approach Albuquerque and our 74th Annual Meeting the board has addressed a number of important issues. These include developing a strategic plan for the future and preparing for our 75th Anniversary. We are also addressing new recommendations for the bylaws, are searching for a new editor for Practicing Anthropology and approving a Program Chair for 2015. These are among the many tasks that the Board will address in Albuquerque.

Importantly we now have our election results. Elections represent more than the “changing of the guard” when new officers enter and those who have served exit. In addition to voting in our new officers, the membership overwhelming approved the SfAA Bylaw recommendations. One of the most important changes is that elections will now be held through electronic balloting. This will allow online voting and make elections much more efficient. Hopefully the ease of online voting will entice more of you to vote. In addition, we approved the name addition that enhances our title: The Society for Applied Anthropology: a Worldwide Organization for the Applied Social Sciences. This simple “name-tag” provides added momentum for enacting and further developing the SfAA International Initiative.

The Changing of the Guard

New officers are crucial to the governance and continuity of SfAA activity, but those individuals who are ending their terms continue to be crucial to the Society. On behalf of the society, I want to recognize those officers who are leaving the board. I do this with respect because these are individuals who have generously given their time and effort to the Society. Maryann McCabe has been an exceptionally engaged member who volunteered to serve on the board this last year. Although Maryann is exiting the board, like so many of our officers, she has volunteered to continue on a variety of
tasks. Michael Paolisso also ends his board term, but fortunately, has volunteered to take on the Secretarial reins for this next year. (The membership will elect a new secretary in 2015). Michael’s commentary and work have been central to board decisions. Our outgoing secretary, Susan Charnley has not only taken our minutes but has been one of the balancing voices on the board. Her honest and open ideas have often kept us on target. Rebecca Crosthwait, our student representative, has brought a needed perspective and fresh ideas to board discussions. Clair Sterk has been consistently active in on-line discussions. Our former President Merrill Eisenberg, will also be exiting the board. Like other officers Merrill continues to be deeply involved in SfAA affairs. Her contagious energy, generosity and hard work have been exemplary and will be missed. One of the rewards of the presidency has been working with this group of dedicated people. Thank you all for your concern and effort. The SfAA is a stronger organization because of you.

**The Election Slate**

This year’s slate of candidates was exemplary. Kerry Feldman and Kathleen DeWalt, outgoing Nominations and Election Committee members, outdid themselves in securing new officers. Members told me, “I wanted all the candidates to win” and “I wanted to vote for them all.” The roster of candidates represented the diversity of interests, gender, and ethnicity that makes up the society. We welcome our new board members, James Loucky, Alicia Cruz, Maria Cruz-Torres and Jessica-Jean Cassler; our new Nominations and Elections officers, Cathleen Crain and James Stansbury, and our new incoming President Elect, Kathleen DeWalt.

The Society also owes a deep gratitude to those dedicated members who were not elected, Ann McElroy, Christian Zlelniski, Maryann McCabe, Christian Ho, Yewoubdar Beyene, Roland Moore and Ona Harris. Ours is a better organization because of members like you. Thank you all for running and for stepping up to the plate.

**Growing Pains and the International Initiative**

In addition to the physical “changing of the guard,” elections bring other types of change. New personalities, new ideas, new visions and new experiences challenge the status quo, as do the changes in our Bylaws. This was in fact one of the goals of this year’s slate: to incorporate diverse views and “fresh” ideas. Change, as applied anthropologists know so well, can be difficult, uncomfortable, and challenging. This is true of the communities with which we work and it is true of our own organization. In addition to re-thinking and injecting “diversity and youth” into our modus operandi, we are faced with a challenge to promote the society as an international entity. The Society’s new name: The Society for Applied Anthropology: a World Wide Organization for the Applied Social Sciences provokes us to think about our global role as an organization that is engaged institutionally with organizations throughout the world. This includes not solely the members who work in global settings and with
international ideas, but an organization that is engaged in transborder networks, collaborating actively with our international colleagues and their institutions.

Our annual meetings, and publications demonstrate our work and mission. They exemplify our efforts and ethical resolve in promoting and engaging applied work throughout the world. Yet, we are facing numerous challenges that will not only affect how the Society functions and performs, but how we will survive the future. The world around us continues to change. We need to ask, “Is the Society changing with it?”

**Albuquerque and the International Dimension**

The upcoming meetings in Albuquerque promise to be one of the most successful conferences we have ever had. The number of organized sessions is approximately 250, more than we have had in previous years. Our registration has surpassed our expectations. The sessions, organized tours, the city itself and surrounding region offer unique and bountiful possibilities.

As in past programs, our 74th Annual Meeting provides a forum to present, engage and seek resolution to social-cultural problems at local, regional, national and global levels. Members from over 60 countries are presenting at these meetings. This international dimension has been a major catalyst at our past Annual Meetings: Seattle (2011) focused on “Expanding the Influence of Applied Anthropology . . . in this globalized world.” In Merida, Mexico (2010) the focus was “Vulnerabilities and Exclusion in Globalization.” When we last met in New Mexico (Santa Fe 2009), “Global Challenge, Local Action: Ethical Engagement and Practice” was the program theme. And in Tampa (2007) “Global Insecurities, Global Solutions and Applied Anthropology in the 21st Century” squarely placed our query on the future. The “global” has indeed been and will continue to be a central issue in the Society. This year’s theme, *Destinations* queries our past, our present and our impending future.

Being “Worldwide” requires our engagement beyond our past involvement. Although we entertain and have international members the SfAA needs to engage institutions and social fields outside of our national realm. The SfAA Annual Meetings are a testament to our members’ global interest but the Society has yet to fully engage ongoing organizational collaborations with institutions in international settings. A few years ago, former President Allan Burns and our colleague Peter Kunstadter instituted an SfAA International Initiative that was aimed at expanding the applied dialogue in institutions and with groups of applied scientists in countries outside of the United States. This included the creation of institutional memberships. President Burns was instrumental in promoting the first SfAA Institutional Membership with anthropologists in El Salvador. Similarly, Ralph Bolton is working with Peruvian Anthropologists who have organized sessions on Applied Anthropology in the Andes for our Albuquerque meetings. These efforts are part of a broader international initiative that targets connection and dialogue with our colleagues and sister institutions throughout the world.
In this vein, with a focus on recruiting Mexican institutions into a collaborative relationship with the SfAA, I have recently met with colleagues from the Universidad Autónoma de Baja California (UABC) and the Colegio de La Frontera Norte (COLEF). These meetings have produced a strong interest in the Society and discussion on themes of special relevance to Mexican social scientists. This evolved into a possible workshop/seminar on Applied Anthropology in Mexico focusing on trans-border issues of concern to both SfAA and Mexican social scientists. It is important to share the wealth of experience and knowledge represented by our membership, and to learn from our Mexican colleagues. The board is beginning to explore how such workshop collaboration can provide a model for similar meetings in other countries.

My recent sojourns into Mexico and along the U.S. Mexico Border to meet with colleagues from the UABC, and COLEF have underscored the need for cooperative dialogue with international and bi-national institutions. Each time I cross into Mexico and re-enter the U.S., I am confronted by a variety of “global” processes and parameters that influence local behavior—my own included. This and the conversations emphasize the contrasting and often conflicting social-cultural issues that provoke comparison and inquiry. The SfAA has illustrated our members’ strength, knowledge and experience working with and resolving practical problems at national and global levels. The Society can be a vivid institutional force and catalyst for sharing, collaborating, learning and ultimately assisting organizations in sound applied science throughout the world. The problems of immigration, violence, education, natural disasters, human rights, climate change, international commerce and business are of specific interest to our Mexican colleagues. Although many of us work in these areas, they take on different meaning outside of our local venues. Comparison and dialogue can only enhance the work we all do.

The SfAA is uniquely suited to collaborate and promote the social fields necessary for creative dialogue. Our meetings exemplify our focus and ethical intent to confront and resolve social-cultural problems throughout the world, and importantly illustrate our organizational strength. Our international initiative provides a mechanism and charge from the membership to engage and interact with institutions of applied social scientists throughout the world.

Annual Meetings

Destination Albuquerque

Erve Chambers
echamber@umd.edu
2014 Program Chair

The 2014 annual meetings to be held next month in Albuquerque (March 18-22) will be among the largest meetings in our Society’s history. As of the first week of February, there were 1,820 participants preregistered. We will have 250 sessions, SfAA News 25(1)
with nearly 1,700 individuals on the program. There are about 90 posters to be presented. We are offering 11 workshops and 14 tours, a record number for our meetings. But there is more to be appreciated here than the numbers. I trust you will be impressed by the overall quality of papers and other activities to be offered, and by the considerable diversity of subjects with which the participants are concerned. Among contributors we have a good mix of academic professionals, student presenters, and I think a larger than usual turnabout of anthropologists and other social scientists who practice outside of academia. Twenty-nine countries are represented among the presenters.

We have tried to be as flexible as possible in encouraging innovative sessions that break the mold of the standard 10 or 15 minute paper session, keeping in mind that our many constituencies (practitioners, academics, students, and the general public) have different needs in respect to how they might best convey and receive knowledge and information. In addition to paper sessions, you will find a considerable number of roundtables and panels throughout the program, and a few experimental sessions that are worth paying attention to. In this regard I am especially pleased with some of the sessions scheduled for *Albuquerque/New Mexico Day* (Tuesday March 18) that include panel discussions in the hotel followed by tours to sites in the Albuquerque area. A discussion of community gardens will, for example, be followed by a tour of three exemplary gardens. Similar panel/tour combinations will be devoted to local health care delivery facilities, the local food movement, and expressions of Native American art. There are also sessions that experiment with both the style and length of presentations.

*Albuquerque/New Mexico Day* (Tuesday, March 18) has been developed as an opportunity to share a part of our meetings with the residents of the region. It will also be an opportunity to showcase anthropology and applied social science. We are publicizing the day locally and have invited the public to attend the day’s sessions free of charge. It is especially pleasing that a good number of Albuquerque residents have agreed to actively participate in the events of the of day—including political leaders, representatives of the media, tribal and Pueblo representatives, staff of public agencies, and local activists. So it is not just “us” talking about “them” behind closed doors but multiple parties freely engaged with important issues. We are pleased that the Albuquerque Public Library has agreed to cosponsor the day and to help with publicity. In addition to the session/tours noted above, some highlights of the day include:

- A panel of local experts on “Water Sharing and Water Shortage in New Mexico” organized and moderated by Michael Agar.
- A multi-session symposium on “Rethinking Puebloan Social Formations” organized by Peter Whiteley and including participants from each of the four traditional anthropological sub disciplines.
A major roundtable discussion of the status of “Behavioral Health Care in New Mexico” chaired by Cathleen Willging, Sabrina Montoya, Christi Fields, and Louise Lamphere, with participation from state legislators, service users and providers, and advocates. This session will be followed by a reception.

A feature devoted to “The Undocumented Youth-Led Struggle for Justice” organized by Steve Pavey and Mariela Nuñez-Janes. Here representatives of the undocumented youth community strive to “re-imagine and renew through visual art, poetry, and aesthetics a social world that society often criminalizes and dehumanizes.” Parts of this session will also be repeated on Saturday, March 22 at the downtown public library.

A two-part session on “Tribal Consultation in the Southwest” organized by Shawn Kelley and Jeff Blythe, with representatives of Native American tribes, government agencies, and other organizations discussing best practices for consulting with tribal representatives in furthering cultural resources preservation and interpretation.

Representatives of regional immigrant community organizations will meet in an open discussion organized by Josiah Heyman.

These are just a few of the activities scheduled for Albuquerque/New Mexico Day. There will also be sessions and talks devoted to New Mexico’s history and heritage, including a talk by Nancy Owen Lewis on Albuquerque’s development as a tuberculosis treatment center and a talk by Kathy Flynn on the New Deal in Albuquerque. A number of sessions are focused on health disparities and interventions in Albuquerque and in the state. We will be entertained by Steve Cormier, the “cowboy with a PhD,” who will provide music from the ranch and open range. On Tuesday evening, the Alfonso Ortiz Center at the University of New Mexico will host a selection of films about New Mexico and the greater Southwest. Tuesday evening will include a performance by the country/blues band A Band Named Sue.

You can anticipate any number of other social events and special presentations during the course of the meeting, starting Wednesday evening with a welcome session co-sponsored by the City of Albuquerque. There will be complimentary food and beverages (come early) and a mariachi band. On Thursday Rodolfo Stravenhagen will present the Michael Kearney lecture. On Friday there will be a capstone session honoring Valene Smith for her pioneering contribution to tourism research. The awards ceremony on Friday evening will include presentations by Paul Durrenberger, the Malinowski Award recipient, and Sera Young, the Margaret Mead Award recipient. Sadly but nonetheless importantly, there will be sessions honoring three of our recently passed comrades—Tony Paredes, Robert Kemper, and Phil Young.

We have 14 tours offered during the 2014 meetings, a record number. The University of New Mexico’s Ortiz Center is helping to sponsor a tour of a plaza revitalization project at the Ohkay Owingeh (Tewa) Pueblo. Beverly Singer will lead the
tour. Orit Tamir has helped organize a tour to visit Laguna Pueblo during St. Joseph’s Feast Day on Wednesday, March 19th. There will be Indian dances, food, and Indian art offered for sale. Noted archaeologist Lynne Sebastian has agreed to lead a tour of the Salinas Pueblo National Mission Monument, which lies to the southeast of Albuquerque. Tey Nunn is the Director of the National Hispanic Cultural Center Art Museum and she will be leading a tour of the museum to include a visit to parts of the museum that are not normally open to the public. There will also be tours of the nearby Petroglyph National Monument, of Sky City at Acoma Pueblo, and of the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center. As of this writing, there was still space in each of these tours, but several were close to being filled.

There are numerous other opportunities to mount self-tours within walking and biking distance of the convention hotel. I noted several of these in a previous report (see the November 2013 issue of SfAA News). Other possibilities are described in the website for the Albuquerque Convention and Visitor’s Bureau (www.visitalbuquerque.org).

The Hotel Albuquerque is a great venue with plenty of space outside the meeting rooms for milling around and meeting people. I understand there are no more rooms at that inn, but information about other nearby lodging can be found on the Society’s website. I do look forward to seeing you in Albuquerque. I’m the guy with the eye glasses.

Albuquerque Update: Tours, Workshops, and Lodging

Tom May
tom@sfaa.net
SfAA Executive Director

Tours

There is still time to register for one (or more) of the tours that will be available in Albuquerque. The following information will provide an update:

The Petroglyph Monument Tour on Tuesday (#2) is almost full; there are four remaining spots.

The tours to Ohkay Owingeh (#5) and Salinas Missions Monument (#7) are unique because of the content and the guides. Prof. Beverly Singer is intimately knowledgeable and the project and she will be assisted by Tomasita Duran, the Executive Director of the Pueblo Housing Authority. This is an exceptional opportunity to learn first-hand about an innovative revitalization project at the Pueblo.

The guide for the Salinas Monument tour, Dr. Lynne Sebastian, is a recognized authority on the archaeology of the Southwest. She has published extensively on archaeology, historic preservation, and cultural resource management. She is a past
President of the Society for American Archaeology. In recognition of her professional expertise, she was appointed by President Obama to serve on the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

The local garden tours (#3 and #4) will provide an insider’s perspective on different forms of urban gardening, as well as the conjunction of gardening and cultural revitalization. Both of the tours on Tuesday follow and build on the content of a regular session (although attendance at the session is not required for the tour).

The other tours have space availability. For a description of each tour and a registration form, go to www.sfaa.net/sfaa2014/2014tours.html. Please contact the SfAA Office if you have any questions.

**Workshops**

There are space limits on the registration for all of the workshops. At this time, all of the workshops have available slots.

The NSF-sponsored workshops (#5, Social Network Analysis; #9, Text Analysis) are special opportunities for our registrants. The instructors for each workshop are acknowledged experts on the topic. The participants in previous workshops have been very satisfied. They have described the workshop as “extremely helpful,” and “carefully prepared and focused in presentation.”

The other workshops also provide specialized information/training on particular topics and methods, from evaluation and participatory action research to business anthropology and mediation.

You can find a more detailed description on each workshop as well as a registration form by going to www.sfaa.net/sfaa2014/2014workshops.html.

**Lodging**

All of the rooms at the Hotel Albuquerque and the Rio Grande Best Western have been sold. If you are searching for lodging, you can still check with these two hotels in the event there are cancellations.

We have recently arranged with the Hotel Blue for a block of rooms. It is located 1.5 miles from the Hotel Albuquerque. It is on Central Avenue (717 Central Avenue, N.W.), and thus, on the public bus line. Hotel Blue has a courtesy airport shuttle service as well as a complimentary breakfast. The shuttle can take guests to the Hotel Albuquerque. Check out the web site: www.thehotelblue.com. We will have detailed information and a contact link on the web site by Friday.
The SfAA Podcast Project: Spring Update

Jo Aiken
jonieaiken@gmail.com
Chair, SfAA Podcast Project
University of North Texas

Angela Ramer
angela.ramer.unt@gmail.com
Associate Chair, SfAA Podcast Project
University of North Texas

The SfAA Podcast Project team is looking forward to the 2014 Annual Meeting in Albuquerque, as we work hard to make this year’s podcast service the best ever. It is our goal to provide members, colleagues, and students across the globe with the means to become engaged with SfAA both during and after the Annual Meeting, regardless of their geographic location. We invite everyone to tune in to the Twitter account, at www.twitter.com/sfaapodcasts, for live updates during the meeting and afterwards for additional information regarding the podcasts.

Session selection

The Podcast Project team recently compiled the results of the annual Session Selection Survey recently created to identify key topics, sessions, and speakers of interest among the anthropology community. Thank you to everyone who completed the survey. Our Digital Media team members, Ian Watt and Shane Pahl, collected the highest number ever of Session Selection Survey responses, which more than doubled last year’s total.

In addition to the survey, the team is working with SfAA staff and the Board to finalize the session selection to ensure the final list is of widespread interest and coordinated well with the Meeting’s theme. The team will begin contacting chairs and participants of the selected sessions in mid-February.
Local volunteers

Angela Ramer and Molly Shade, our Communications Coordinators, also began recruiting local volunteers. If you are a student, or know students in any discipline that lives in the Albuquerque area and may attend the SfAA conference, please encourage them to send an email to sfaapodcasts@gmail.com for more information on assisting the Podcast Project. Benefits include free registration and SfAA Membership for one year.

Randy’s back!

We are very pleased to announce that Randy Sparrazza will be returning this year as our Audio Professional! Randy adds to the professional element of the podcast product we strive to deliver. He has worked with a wide variety of high impact clients including regional TV commercials, indie movie productions, NFL films, CBS Sports, and Kodak. Randy continues to bring great ideas on how to improve the podcast service, and he is an all-around nice guy to work with. For more information on Randy and our other team members, visit the SfAA Podcast Project’s Team page at www.sfaapodcasts.net/sfaa-podcast-team/.

Are you attending the Annual Meeting in March?

Do you have an idea, comments, suggestions, or a high five for the Podcast Team? Please visit our booth at the Annual Meeting or feel free to find us working throughout the conference. Team members will be wearing blue SfAA Podcast Team lanyards and will be passing out "SfAA Podcast Project" business cards with link information to the podcasts and our social media outlets.

Podcasts from SfAA Annual Meetings can be listened to or downloaded at www.sfaapodcasts.net or from iTunes.

Follow the SfAA Podcast Project team on Twitter and Facebook at http://twitter.com/sfaapodcasts http://facebook.com/sfaapodcasts

Commentaries

We Almost Lost Detroit, Remember?: Applied Anthropology and the Fermi–Fukushima Connection

Brian McKenna
mckenna193@aol.com
University of Michigan-Dearborn

SfAA News 25(1)
“It stands out on a highway like a Creature from another time. It inspires the babies’ questions, ‘What’s that?’ they ask their mothers as they ride”

—Gil Scott Heron, “We Almost Lost Detroit” 1990

As the third anniversary of the Fukushima meltdowns comes upon us in March, it’s time to reflect on our own Fukushimas. In 1966 the Fermi nuclear reactor outside Detroit Michigan suffered a partial meltdown and came close to a nuclear explosion (Sovacool 2011, Fuller 1975). News of this event was kept from the public for several years. The story was fully revealed in the powerful 1975 book, We Almost Lost Detroit by investigative journalist John Fuller. If you question people on the streets of Detroit today few have any knowledge of the near cataclysm despite ample documentation. It’s as though it never happened.

When I question my students at the University of Michigan-Dearborn, just 30 miles from the melt-downed reactor, it’s the same reaction. Most know about Fukushima, although remarkably little, given its newsworthiness. So I remind them that on March 11, 2011, a 9.0 magnitude earthquake impacted Fukushima resulting in billions in damage and crippling the Japanese nuclear industry. The catastrophe caused Germany to declare a three-month moratorium on its plan to prolong the life of its nuclear plants and shut down seven of its oldest facilities.

Not so in Michigan. In 2014, DTE Energy (formerly Detroit Edison), the corporation responsible for the 1966 Fermi meltdown, is pushing hard to upscale its nuclear capacity by building a Fermi 3 complex. It turns out that most UMD campus students I speak to don’t even know where their electricity comes from let alone the pros and cons of nuclear power.

“How many of your students know where their electricity comes from?” I ask. Many colleges were funneling interns into the facility, no doubt. But how many were critically assessing the risks? “We are now those people. And in Detroit, which has already suffered a partial meltdown, risking tens of thousands of lives, there’s no excuse to ignore the issue.”

I then play them an 8 minute YouTube rendition of the mesmerizing Gil Scott Heron song about the epic close-call (Scott-Heron and his Amnesia Express 1990).

Nuclear Civic Engagement

And yet, few Michigan citizens or professors speak out, aside from a small contingent of dedicated activists. DTE Energy has great influence with Michigan institutions (including universities). The corporation has operations in 26 states and in 2013 was ranked 299 in the Fortune 500, with revenues of $8.8 billion.

In Barbara Johnston’s 2007 edited book, Half Lives and Half Truths, the decades-old silence within medicine and professional life (including anthropology) regarding nuclear catastrophes is duly noted. When scientists produced data that contradicted
the official story they found themselves outcasts, discredited, or unemployed. The message: there are severe consequences for asking questions. The results are deplorable. As Johnston puts it, “control over scientific findings allowed the systematic use of half-truths to pacify public concerns while expanding the nuclear war machine.”

Johnston presents 14 case studies which challenge this silence. In one, Edith Turner reflects upon how she transformed from a traditional academic into what Johnston calls a “proactive scholar-advisor-advocate who works for and with her host community” (Johnson 2007:14). Turner eventually circulated in the corridors of power in Washington DC on behalf of her community. This is how applied anthropology becomes public pedagogy, a vital front of civic engagement in this age of enforced neoliberal passivity.

Inspired by these anthropologists, I now begin this work through UMD’s Civic Engagement program. The program cites Paulo Freire as an inspiration, a fact I use to full advantage. The recentness of the Fukushima meltdown provides another pedagogical opening to cut through the silences in university life about the dangers of nuclear power. In the winter of 2012 I organized my Environmental Anthropology class of 40 into seven groups (of five to six members each) as part of a civic engagement with the local nuclear culture. They conducted field site visits to the outskirts of the Fermi complex and to Monroe, Michigan, the adjacent city. They interviewed experts, researched official data, made interpretations and delivered group presentations on their findings. I provide a synopsis of students’ 2012 findings below. I just returned to Fermi this semester, winter 2014. This time our partner is Keith Gunter, co-chair of Alliance to Stop Fermi 3. We are using several excellent books mostly by anthropologists (including Brown 2013, Gusterson 2004, Masco 2006, Stoler 2013). More on this experience will follow in a future article.

**Nuclear Energy for Beginners**

I find that it is necessary to provide an orientation to get students sufficiently motivated to engage the issue. I require Johnston’s book, in which she and her fourteen anthropology colleagues make abundantly clear that it’s not just the nuclear meltdown disasters but the cradle-to-grave circuit of nuclear production: (1) uranium mining (Navaho miners were especially hard hit with thousands of deaths), (2) uranium processing (there are 2.35 billion tons of radioactive “tailings” the crushed rock remaining after uranium extraction), (3) weapons development (as recently as 2001-2004 tens of millions of cubic meters of liquid radioactive waste was dumped into Russia’s Techa River), (4) testing (2,057 nuclear tests have occurred the world over spreading fallout far and wide), and (5) disposal (anthropologist Turner, astounded at a very high cancer rate in Alaska’s Inupiat community helped uncover a nearby radioactive dump site in the 1990s). The amount of illness and disease from thyroid cancer, leukemia, birth abnormalities and other conditions are far more extensive than previously thought. The anxiety of living next to a radiogenic site is permanently felt by millions.
I tell students that a nuclear reactor is merely another way to boil water to generate electricity (though many facilities can also produce weapons grade plutonium). Nuclear energy production is 44 times more dangerous than renewable methods like wind and solar. We view the film, *Into Eternity* (2012) about Onkalo, the world’s first permanent nuclear waste repository (available on the Internet). Onkalo is a Finnish word for hiding place. It is a very strong indictment about nuclear waste disposal. Fermi continues to be a very dangerous institution. Among the concerns is the fact that most of its nuclear waste is stored in 40-foot deep circular pools that are running out of room. DTE was supposed to transfer this high-level waste to dry storage years ago.

In the 2012 course, I contacted Kay Cumbow with Citizens for Alternatives to Chemical Contamination (CACC) and she agreed to serve as a historian/educator with my class. She put me in touch with Michael Keegan, Co-Chair, United States Coalition for a Nuclear-Free Great Lakes and leader of Don’t Waste Michigan, a group challenging Fermi 3. He addressed our class and served as valuable resource round the clock. Students reviewed the literature, investigated newspaper archives, conducted interviews, establish key informants, review government documents and worked closely with me and activists in developing research strategies and ideas.

**Some Findings**

One student, a journalist with the *Michigan Journal*, the campus newspaper, conducted a content analysis of all newspapers from 1963 to the present. He found not one critical story about Fermi. There was one story in 1991 about 18 students of the Society of Physics visiting DTE in the summer to learn how it produced electricity. “We are pleased the UMD students visited the Fermi 2 site,” said the senior VP of nuclear generation.

Several students noted that the most vigorous governmental critics of Fermi were state-level Department of Natural Resources (DNR) officials who worked closely in the environment surrounding Fermi. In her site visit to Fermi one student interviewed a DNR Ranger at Sterling State Park. He said that Fermi had an enormously bad impact on the marshland there. He informed her that the DNR had just received a $2.85 million grant from the EPA to help restore the wetlands. They intend to restore 25 acres of high-shallow waters (“something that, he whispered, was mainly due to Fermi 2 pumping into the River basin”) and improve fish and wildlife lagoon habitat. She noted that the swimmers and fishermen she interviewed didn’t care. One camper in the park, when asked about the nuclear plant being so close to her children, said, “I don’t ever think much of it. I know it’s there. I can see it. But at the same time I almost never see it. It just blends in as I watch my kids swim.” The woman paused and then added, “I would be more concerned about a storm coming and electrocuting them than the water being polluted.”

Another DNR fieldworker was quite frank with another student. “The water temperatures have been rising yearly, and as a result the fish populations have been
dwindling ... migratory birds which we once saw in abundance are now a scarcity, and we are noticing a gradual increase in the amount of dead animals we find. But we should [close our eyes and apparently] believe DTE when they say there are no risks when it comes to nuclear power.” The student reported that the DNR fieldworker added, “What I really don’t understand are the citizens of Monroe. They have a cancer factory in their backyard yet they pretend like it doesn’t even exist. I feel like I am working in a town full of zombies at times.”

**Popping the Nuclear Pill**

According to medical experts, potassium iodide pills are to be administered immediately in the wake of a serious nuclear event to protect peoples’ thyroids. Local pharmacies within 10 miles of Fermi are required to provide the tablets free of charge to residents within that perimeter. However when students checked with local schools within that perimeter they found some schools that did not have them. One school official reported that the Monroe County Health Department had offered the school free tablets but that they declined. They said schools are required to have permission slips before any medical treatments are administered. Another student works as a pharmacy tech within a 50-mile radius of Fermi. When she asked her boss, the lead pharmacist, about the availability of the tablets for consumers, the pharmacist admitted that she had never heard of potassium iodide tablets before, and, in fact, had never heard of the Fermi nuclear power plant!

Karmanos, a major cancer hospital in the region, devoted much attention on its website about the dangers of radiation in the environment, focusing on radon and its sources. Incredibly, they made no mention of radiation emitting from the local nuclear facility. The student concluded, “Fermi is not seen as a health risk by [medical] people because it is not an obvious threat, you cannot see it coming, and so people do not have the concern that they should have over living so close to a nuclear plant.”

Another student asked a woman who lives within ten miles of Fermi about the evacuation plans. The informant said, “I’m so close. I wouldn’t have time to get out. I’d just be dead or else wish I was. The escape route is a joke. There’s only one little two-lane road going in and out, and you know, there’s a school back there. No parents will leave their kid behind. They’ll be heading back to the school and gumming up the roads. People won’t be able to get out as fast as they say.” This student interviewed another woman, who said she’d lived in Monroe for 14 years but only received the evacuation information one time, in the wake of the Fukushima disaster.

After speaking with several Monroe citizens, one group concluded that, “the overall consensus was that Monroe’s residents don’t seem concerned about Fermi, the health effects it may cause, or the potential for a nuclear disaster. In fact, many of the people that were consulted thought that we were ‘crazy’ for asking questions about it.”
Greenwashing

Students felt that many environmental groups seem to have been “bought off.” A student reported that: “DTE has formed partnerships with many conservation, wildlife, fishery and environmental quality organizations. The plan for these companies is to do what’s called ‘greenwashing.’ The idea is to make it look as though these companies are environmentally friendly by really masking the threat that they are posing to the environment. It’s as if someone was beating you in the face while wearing a non-violence t-shirt.”

Another student met with an invitation only workshop on March 18, 2012, sponsored by several activist groups including Mike Keegan and our own classroom mentors with CACC and associated with “Stop Fermi Three.” Lois Gibbs, the Love Canal leader and founder the Center for Health, Environment and Justice spoke (Gibbs 2014). The student found that there “there are enough activists to stop Fermi 3 but they are not taken seriously.”

Erasing Collective Memory

Another civic engagement student performed a content analysis of DTE’s web based educational program for children, titled “DTEkids” (See DTEKids 2014). She found that it was dedicated to renewable energy and had many fun and interactive games for children to play on topics of solar energy, geothermal, wind and hydro. “Hi, I am Jay! Help your family plant a tree. It helps clean the air we breathe and saves energy too!” She noted that DTE focused attention on the “Family Emergency Supply Kit,” which listed things like canned foods, flashlight, water, first aid kits, and toys.” However, she noted that there was one thing on the emergency supply kit missing: potassium iodide pills. In fact, she noted that she was shocked that nuclear energy was not even mentioned. “It was almost as if nuclear energy was the elephant in the room that DTE refused to acknowledge,” she said.

In 2012 Detroit Edison won another battle. It worked behind the scenes to finance $2.9 million in a deceptive ad campaign by a front group named CARE, which succeeded in defeating Michigan’s Proposal 3 which would have required that Michigan obtain 25 percent of its energy from renewable resources (like wind, solar and hydro) by the year 2025. The front group, CARE, used the words clean and renewable in its name. Citizens were not informed that DTE and the nuclear industry were working to seek its defeat.

Yes, Fermi is an elephant in the room, even in the wake of Fukushima. Major Detroit area institutions reproduce this elephant by their actions and omissions.

A hegemon of institutions—in media, universities, medicine, government, and the corporate world—function to erase collective memory via omission, neglect and a neoliberal ideology that favors nuclear power. In this vein, DTE is presenting a Clean Energy Prize as an annual entrepreneurship competition that challenges teams from colleges and universities in Michigan to develop the best plan for bringing new clean-
energy technologies to market (ignoring its behind the scenes work to derail clean energy public policy). It is open to students and faculty from any Michigan college or university. There is no prize, however, to help restore the collective memory of how “we almost lost Detroit,” and the University of Michigan itself.
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Applying the Social Sciences: Examples and Models from the Field

Archaeology and Education at Fort St. Joseph

Erica D’Elia, Erin Claussen, and Michael Nassaney
Western Michigan University

The Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project (FSJAP) is a partnership between Western Michigan University and the City of Niles, Michigan dedicated to the excavation and interpretation of Fort St. Joseph, an eighteenth-century French coloni-
al fort. Over the years it has offered a multitude of opportunities for the public to learn about the history of the fort, become involved in the excavations, and engage in an inclusive collaborative venture. Archaeologists are increasingly viewing public groups as collaborators rather than simply audiences for their work. Likewise, at Fort St. Joseph people are encouraged to become active participants in the excavations and research.

FSJAP archaeologists strive to educate the public about archaeology and heritage management and its summer archaeology camp is one way for people to become involved. The FSJAP runs three week-long summer camp programs: one for adult life-long learners, one for middle school students, and one for educators. Each week follows a similar format. Participants spend the morning in the classroom learning about Fort St. Joseph as an historic and archaeological site and its importance in the local community. In the afternoon they are fully integrated into the fieldwork being conducted by FSJAP staff and WMU field school students. Here, campers learn how to conduct all aspects of archaeological excavation from research design to data recovery, analysis, and interpretation. Here, we will discuss how the archaeological process engages and educates the middle school student summer campers and educators.

The middle school campers are a self-selected group of participants since the program is designed to attract kids who are interested in history. For these students the camp presents a unique opportunity to explore and share their interest with other like-minded peers. Most of these students are first exposed to archaeology in school where the focus is placed on ancient empires such as Rome, Greece, and Egypt. At the camp these students learn how history is also being unearthed right in their own backyard. Although the finds at Fort St. Joseph are more likely to be fragments of bone and pieces of lead shot, rather than gold coins, this did not put a damper on the students’ excitement to be unearthing materials from the past. They learn that every rusty nail is a clue in the forgotten story of our nation’s past.

For archaeologists, it seems easy to teach by doing archaeology. Working in the field appeals to students, where the focus is on the element of discovery, certainly inherent to archaeology, but not paramount to interpretation. The laboratory is where archaeologists identify and analyze the material they find, enabling them to use the data to form interpretations of what happened in the past. By incorporating analytical lab activities in the Project’s outreach programs, such as looking for patterns in artifact assemblages, interpreting sites, as well as identifying objects and thinking about how they were used, archaeologists can help tap into students’ critical thinking skills, while providing a hands-on experience. The students in the FSJAP camp work to
identify and record artifacts, and are then asked to derive interpretations from their observations. It is easy to see how the campers use the information learned and experiences in the field, in order to link objects to action.

One student commented that his favorite activity had been using a faunal study collection to identify animal remains from the site and better understand the diet of its occupants. He enjoyed this task because it enabled him to figure out what kinds of animals the fort’s inhabitants consumed, and what parts of the animals they used. Sure, it would have been easy to simply tell the class that white tailed deer was the dietary staple, making up a majority of the animal remains found. Instead, students were asked to figure that out for themselves. What was likely to be a quickly forgotten fact, now became an experience for the student to remember, historical knowledge that he was empowered to create.

Through the middle school camps a select few children have the opportunity to engage in archaeology each summer. The camp program for educators targets a different demographic: school teachers, who have the ability to reach far more students than archaeologists could ever hope to. The goal of the educator’s camp is to generate collaborative relationships between archaeologists and teachers and consider how archaeology can be used as a tool to enhance learning outcomes in the classroom. Recent participants in the program have brought with them a range of educational experience, spanning the entire K-12 spectrum, including teachers of social studies and civics, language arts, science, math, and even a guidance counselor and library media specialist. The teachers we have worked with see children as active participants in their own education and use inquiry based lessons to develop their knowledge and critical thinking skills. The hands-on nature of archaeology, as well as the analytical skills used to interpret data make it an appealing educational tool; the aim is to teach through archaeology, rather than about it (Bartoy 2012).

One of the major positive outcomes of this program is how the teachers have been able to translate what they learn through the program into lesson plans in their classrooms. The teacher’s uses typically fell into three categories: (1) teaching topics derived from archaeology; (2) using artifacts as examples that help students relate to history; and (3) using archaeological principles to teach other subjects. For example, one of the teachers talked about stratigraphy in science class. While at the elementary school level students performed some of the ceramic analysis that archaeologists use. In language arts, students were asked to write about artifacts and how those symbolized their lives. In history lessons artifacts and knowledge of Fort St. Joseph were brought in as examples. One third grade math teacher even snuck an archaeological example into her word problems, asking students, “If it takes two deer to feed 25 soldiers at the Fort for three days, how many deer would they need for a week, a month, or a year?” Then, she asked students to consider change over time, “Would there always be 25 soldiers at the Fort?” Assignments such as these do not attempt to teach students archaeology as a field of study, nor should that be the primary goal of educator outreach programs. Instead, they ask students to engage with materials and re-
quire them to come up with their own responses, rather than a pre-determined and objectively correct answer.

The ultimate goal of the assignments created by Fort St. Joseph camp alumni was to understand people. The students analyzed artifacts and used them to make inferences about the people who used them. Teachers could easily fall into a trap of discussing objects simply as things, but this is not how archaeologists view them. When students are asked to write about what artifacts best represent themselves, they begin to consider ways in which the material goods they have tell a story about their lives. They begin to see artifacts as a source of information about people. They also make connections with the past through artifacts, especially in lessons such as one used at a Catholic school. The students learned about French Jesuits who shared many of their beliefs. The artifacts, like crosses and rings, were similar to objects they may own and value as symbols of their faith. Likewise, the elementary school ceramic lesson also asked students to consider people. Though the students were looking at a ceramic vessel they were not asked to provide a description of the artifact, instead, they were asked to think about who might have used the piece and for what purpose. When the focus is placed on people as the object of study, the artifact is seen as a source of information. History, especially in schools, is taught using a textbook and sometimes with the addition of archival or documentary sources. This biases both what topics students learn, and what they understand to be valid sources about the past. Though the teachers did not explicitly teach archaeology, they introduced students to the concept of materials as informational sources. The teachers’ uses of artifacts begin to break down the idea that written sources are the only way to learn about the past.

Archaeology can be done with children as simply a fun activity, but as seen in these examples, its potential as a tool for education goes much further. The hands-on nature of archaeology is appealing to students, but is truly valuable when it goes beyond fun and towards engaged learning. The middle school students frequently characterize the camp experience as “fun.” When asked to reflect on why it is fun they were able to recognize that they are indeed learning through the process. For these reasons, archaeology is not the main goal of the summer camp; it is a tool for critical thinking with the ultimate goal of empowering children to create their own knowledge and to engage in the world around them. For the educators, working in collaborative partnerships with archaeologists allows them to contribute their own educational expertise to

Fort St. Joseph archaeology students instruct campers to screen soil and identify artifacts.
bring archaeological methods into the classroom. Knowledge is not a set of immutable facts, but rather the building of an understanding and process of asking questions, making inferences, and gradually coming to a conclusion. When archaeological outreach is conducted from a framework that empowers students in the process, they learn more than just a set of skills and facts.

Bartoy, Kevin
2012

Oral History Project

Introduction to Oral History Interview with Muriel (Miki) Crespi

Shirley J. Fiske
University of Maryland

Muriel Crespi, or Miki, as she preferred to be called, was the Chief Ethnographer of the National Park Service. She asked me to interview her for the SfAA oral history project, as she entered a period of relative remission in her battle with cancer—and she knew it was important to capture her story at that point in her life. We had known each other for over 20 years, ever since she came to Washington, D.C., and were friends and colleagues; she saw me as a comrade in the struggle to introduce the human-centered approaches of anthropology to federal agencies.

Miki’s rich experience and insights took three interview sessions, each about an hour, and she would tire towards the end. Miki loved her work and the challenges of working with the National Park Service, and continued working until her death on April 25, 2003. She received the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology’s Omer C. Stewart Award in 1992, and the AAA’s Solon T. Kimball Award for Public and Applied Anthropology in 1994.

Miki’s interview takes a chronological course, beginning with her graduate studies and fieldwork in Ecuador, her return to the U.S., her odyssey to find what applied anthropology meant to her, and the right opportunity to apply it. Fortuitously, she came to Washington, D.C. to find an applied job and was hired by the National Park Service, which was looking to create a program in cultural anthropology.

With strong vision of the possible, and doggedness, Miki pursued building a new federal program—and she created it out of “scratch,” as she put it. She was gifted in many ways. Her goal was to introduce the Park Service staff and superintendents to the human side of resource management—the way she saw it was “healing the disconnect between resources and people” that was an ingrained historic artifact of the NPS’ primary mission to preserve the natural resources of national parks.
The story of how she did this is remarkably instructive. She realized that the first step was to codify mandates for ethnography and inclusiveness in Park policy and guidance documents and to educate park managers and interpreters. This takes a long time. She built these efforts around recently passed legislation (AIRFA, followed by ANILCA, NAGPRA, and other statutes) which required parks to deal with people; that is to undertake consultation, consider subsistence livelihoods, and recognize traditionally associated peoples. “The language of the law has to be transformed into the context of a particular federal agency” she stated. Anthropologists have “special sensitivity to a segment of the American public that often is overlooked except in the most superficial way. They understand what it means to consult with people in a meaningful way.”

She built an internal AND external team. Her recollections show in detail how national anthropological associations can be effective in shaping and enabling new programs at specific points in their development in (a) appropriations and (b) developing guidance and “regulations” that became Park policy.

She introduced critical concepts into policy and practice in the NPS. The goal was to recognize, include, acknowledge, and consult with contemporary people of all ethnicities and income levels—not just well-known historical figures and families. Concepts such as rapid ethnographic appraisals (REAPs), “traditionally associated peoples” and communities; and “ethnographic resources”—“those sites, structures, objects, those tangible resources that are traditionally valued by present-day people because they contributed to their history and or their life.” Miki says, “It seemed to me a way to highlight the fact that people attach meaning to the sites, structures, objects, and landscapes and that it is the meaning that in a sense transforms those tangible resources into something of greater value for the viewers or the users.”

These concepts which seem so well-accepted now were almost revolutionary in the early years. Miki pioneered courses in multicultural interpretation and with ethnic and racial groups, bringing groups of NPS employees and community members together, sometimes for the first time, to introduce them to the Ethnography Program. Her ethnography of Cane River NHP contributed to the interpretation of slavery for NPS historic sites. Her efforts helped bridge the gap between contemporary people and parks, and showed how people are connected to parks and attribute meaning to them. The ethnography program was dedicated to documenting and understanding the views of somewhat “invisible” groups to make a full picture of our past and current landscapes, geographic features, historic and non-existing structures, and communities themselves.

Ultimately, she developed a cadre of dedicated regional and park ethnographers across the NPS who continue to carry the message, mission and objectives of applied anthropology forward, and to bring “people” into Parks’ everyday life. Unfortunately, the position of Chief Ethnographer remains unfilled over 10 years after her death, in part due to the sequential effects of presidential Administration with different priorities, sequestrations, and flat and declining budgets. As retirements mount, regional ethnography positions become vulnerable in regions across the US, putting the pro-
gram in jeopardy. Much needs to be done to reinvigorate and re-institute the program and to protect against further erosion. It is hoped that the NPS will demonstrate its support of the program by selecting a Chief Ethnographer/anthropologist for the ethnography program in the near future.

Creating a Presence of Applied Anthropology in the National Park Service: An SfAA Oral History Interview with Muriel “Miki” Crespi

Shirley J. Fiske
University of Maryland

These interviews were conducted by Shirley J. Fiske on a number of dates in late 2002 and early 2003. The transcripts which follow were edited for accuracy and readability by John van Willigen and Shirley J. Fiske. The on-line version is far longer.

CRESPI: And before I go into that further I want to give some of the context for this because introducing the program and attempting to maintain it has proved to be enormously complicated, challenging, frustrating, and disappointing in some respects. I think the small successes—or sometimes I think they’re pretty big but other times I think they’re pretty small—but they required considerable investment of time and energy, negotiation internally within the National Park Service, building alliances externally with people who were outside the agency and a great deal of persistence. And I think if people inside the agency and people outside the agency want to fully understand the agency dynamics they need to know a little bit more about what went in to building the program, the context for it. I should also point out that I worked for the Park side of the National Park Service. This is, like other federal agencies, a complicated agency and it has two different faces. The National Park Service actually consists of national parks, almost four hundred of them, but it has another division that’s sometimes called the external program or the partnership program that works with states and local government and that’s not the part that I worked with. That’s the part that deals with the National Register and National Landmarks and they have a different set of staff and a different mission and different budgets. [New NPS staff] will gain from being better informed about the agency, will be able to do more productive work that will be mutually beneficial to themselves and to the agency if they have this background and because the agency is such a large one there are actually few people in the agency who really know how the program was
started. And I think it would be helpful to them should they hear these tapes, to also have a better understanding of why and when and how the program was started and it would help in collaboration among different programs and different people ...

FISKE: Absolutely.

CRESPI: ... if this information is made more available. So, let me say something then about the context. This Park Service is an old-line agency established by Congress in 1916 as one of the agencies within the Department of the Interior, one of the many land managing agencies. Its mission was legislatively defined as conserving the natural resources and conserving historical objects which may be big, like houses and whole farms that they would refer to as objects and preserving these objects and resources—which we now call them—so they can be enjoyed in ways that will leave them unimpaired for future generations. So this is really a sort of traditionally tripartite division of protecting natural resources, protecting historical, including archaeological resources, and providing for the enjoyment of visitors. Now, the ideological basis for agency action flows from this mission statement as it does for other agencies. And it’s expressed in various facets of the agency operations, in funding, in budget allocations, in demographics, in hiring practices, in that most of the people that are hired are people who will work on these aspects of the agency: natural resources, history, archaeology, and visitor services. It’s expressed in governance documents and in our policies and procedures. It’s expressed in the chain of command, in the distribution of decision making responsibilities ...

FISKE: Right.

CRESPI: ... and stretch it ... throughout this there runs this division. Budget is separate, natural resources has its budget ...

FISKE: Yeah, that’s right, it does.

[Pause, Interview resumed on September 21st]

FISKE: And the last time when we were talking I remember that you had arrived in Washington and had just gotten a job with the Park Service and there were several things that you wanted to talk about from there.

CRESPI: Right. Now, I think I had reviewed briefly the structure of the National Park Service, the milieu in which my job existed and had noted some of the traditional perspectives of the Park Service with regard to human beings, the living people, had mentioned that the focus of the Park Service tended to be, where cultural resources were concerned, tended to be on the past, on historical figures and archaeological cultures but contemporary living peoples and their recent past were not of significance to the Park Service. Only if people were visitors were they important but the ways of life of other people were not deemed significant although it’s true that since NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act of ‘69 and the call for public involvement and for public hearings people were expected to play a more prominent role in the decision making for the Park Service and all federal agencies.

FISKE: Right.

CRESPI: And that meant that the federal agencies needed to revise their own perspectives on decision making and I think we may have mentioned that the Park
Service, like other federal agencies, was accustomed to getting advice from within the agency rather than from people outside the agency and had the greatest confidence in their own people who understood constraints and the legal apparatus. So seeking input from other people—from the public ... while they did this because obviously it was the law and it was important in many ways, and they were interested in hearing what people had to say—it nevertheless made functionaries, it created new demands on them, new perspectives, new ways of thinking about the decision making process because they no longer controlled this exclusively.

**FISKE:** It takes a long time for rules to get in place and I think agencies were generally still struggling with how to manage with this new mandate which included people so I can see why the Park Service was still focused in other directions.

**CRESPI:** And the whole notion of social impact assessment that grew out of the regulations for the law was relatively new; and that had led to the creating social science positions in the Park Service and I think social science in a lot of other federal agencies, or bureaus within Interior and hiring sociologists to get that work done—to do social impact assessment.

**FISKE:** From social impact assessment bureau, I think you mentioned that before, is this outside of D.C.?

**CRESPI:** Well, no, social science was created as a subdivision in the Park Service of the Natural Resources component. I don’t know why but that’s the way it was and they were responsible for working with the planners on doing social impact assessments. And I guess it became important also in Alaska when the Alaskan parks were established about ten years later.

**FISKE:** Well, at any rate you were not in social science?

**CRESPI:** No. And anthropology is not considered part of social science. It is not considered ...

**FISKE:** economic?...

**CRESPI:** ... it’s not history either. We are completely excluded. The social science program consists of sociologists, there are one or two political scientists, and economists....

**FISKE:** That’s right. You talked about this, they do mainly visitors surveys and visitors satisfaction ...

**CRESPI:** Right. And we are marginal, considered marginal to that. But while they addressed people and visitors surveys looked at people, it’s not the anthropological approach to trying to grasp the human dimensions of the resources we manage and the resources we value and why they are valued. It’s a statistical approach and survey research on what visitors want to see and what they actually see and where they come from and how long they stay and what they buy and features of that sort. And social impact assessments are no longer being done ... I guess for many years they haven’t been done in the Park Service. Anyway dealing with human beings created a lot of problems and one way to deal with them was not to deal with it. So, in any event there were a lot of obstacles to introducing the notion that contemporary human beings have something valuable to offer the Park Service particularly when they are the
people whose heritage resources are being interpreted by the Park Service to the public.

FISKE: Right.

CRESPI: So, the first group of people that became important and which justified my hiring were American Indian people because there was this spate of legislation telling agencies to pay attention, listen to them.

FISKE: Right.

CRESPI: Okay. But even working with American Indians was not an easy task for many reasons. But generally, what I perceived as being the steps that I needed to take included the following and I’ll just go through them quickly.

FISKE: Okay.

CRESPI: And one is, creating a team of people within the National Park Service hierarchy who were supportive or could be supportive of what I was trying to do and since I was viewed as so marginal to the real Park Service mission [chuckle] it was imperative that I get the support from people in the chain of command above me because without their support as you know nothing can be accomplished in a federal agency. You must have the commitment from higher levels in the bureaucracy and it took about ten years for that to happen. And one of the things that I did would be to try to draw attention to what I was doing by sending copies of my trip reports up the hierarchy, up the ladder.

[Pause]

CRESPI: The associate who worked there, Jerry Rogers, was a historian and totally committed to history as a process for learning the truth and there was … okay, there was no point in arguing [chuckle] about that. But he became interested in what I was doing and what my perceptions were and he actually read my trip reports and made comments on them …

FISKE: Wow.

CRESPI: … sent them back to me and I was delighted with that because it meant that further down the road as things evolved he conceivably would be supportive of me.

FISKE: That’s great stuff.

CRESPI: And he was very interested in American Indians and there was no program in the Park Service that paid attention to them except this little fledgling ethnography program so Jerry was very taken with that and it took many years for him to act on his interest or to get him to act on those interests [chuckle]. There were a number of associate directors and he was the associate director for cultural resources and someone whom I came to rely on for major support, as somebody who could, you know, once he understood what the program was about, once he could get his mouth around the word ethnography, he was the one who would carry the message to his colleagues and to higher levels of authority. And ultimately Jerry worked with me and my boss and with his own deputy and met with SfAA and AAA and WAPA members to take the steps that would bring the program to the attention of Congress
and ultimately to reach a point where we had viability in the budget process but I’m getting a little ahead of myself.

**FISKE:** He was part of the team, right?

**CRESPI:** He was crucial to the team. I could do nothing unless I had Jerry’s support and approval because he was the one who passed the first line in the budget process. He was the one who had the greatest visibility in the cultural resources program, he was the one who stood for all of us, who represented us to the Park Service and to external constituents so getting his support was crucial. And he managed a great many programs and had a lot of interest in what he was doing and was very interested in parks which was very nice. [He] was a hiker. He enjoyed visiting parks. He enjoyed some measure of hands-on relationships with people in parks.

**FISKE:** Yeah, that can vary with the different associate directors so …

**CRESPI:** Yeah. And he was crucial. Finally after a number of years he was crucial in giving us permission to reallocate some of the funds under his control.

**FISKE:** Yeah. Wow.

**CRESPI:** In order for that to happen, of course, there were many other steps and one was, institutionalizing a concern for contemporary living people and ethnography in the government’s documents and these came up for periodic review. When I first got to the Park Service there was a guideline that was being reviewed and worked on for a number of years and that was the first opportunity to put in language about ethnography and cultural anthropology into the cultural resources guideline and this is a major document that parks are supposed to refer to, to guide them in decision making about history, archaeology, cultural landscapes, and for the first time ethnography.

**FISKE:** Right.

**CRESPI:** Several years later an even more important document came up for revision and this was 1988 so it was like seven years after I was there. National Park Service management policies came up for revision and this was … God, so exciting. This would be the first time ever that we would be able to get something about cultural anthropology into this major document. Now this document …

**FISKE:** That’s great.

**CRESPI:** … this is the document … that’s policy so it is above the guidelines, it consists of general statements about what the National Park Service is supposed to do in order to implement the legal framework, in order to implement executive orders and other directives that came from the White House. So I was able to get language in there and so people will pay attention to contemporary living people and we will do ethnography and all the critical words got in there …

**FISKE:** That’s incredible.

**CRESPI:** … so I could then use that to justify anything we did to the rest of the National Park Service because of once it was in the policy statement. And, of course, the policies are reviewed by the director and dozens of high muckety-mucks and goes to the solicitor’s office and gets reviewed by all of the attorneys so it’s a substantial document.

**FISKE:** Right.
CRESPI: And for the first time there was a language about community groups traditionally associated people [with] ethnographic resources. In the 1978 policies there was no mention of any human beings except for Indians. Three times Indians were mentioned and it all had to do with selling arts and crafts in the stores.

FISKE: Yeah.

CRESPI: Never ... nothing ... there was nothing about consultation and this is ‘78, this is eight years after NEPA, nothing about consultation of tribes, nothing about working collaboratively, nothing. So there were like three mentions of tribes in ‘78. In the 1988 document there were about thirty-five mentions of tribal people, community groups and all of the words that we needed got in there.

FISKE: Was this a major uphill struggle where you have to go to hundreds of meetings and write a lot of background justification or was the Park Service pretty ready to accept this at that point? I mean the management policy had come up for review but that's not a guarantee that somebody is going to be able to get input into it and to affect the end policy.

CRESPI: We have an Office of Policy, and the Office is not responsible for the program areas, it’s responsible for insuring that the procedures are correct, that the policy accurately reflects legislation and they don’t write our stuff. Each program area, history writes its part, natural resources writes its part, but it all flows through the Policy Office. So the head of the Policy Office, Carol Aten who is an attorney was very supportive of what I was trying to do, as was Jerry Rogers.

FISKE: Well, that's great.

CRESPI: And there was, some discussion with history and with archaeology but archaeology was part of the program, the office that I was in, so I expected support from them and my boss was also the boss of Park archaeology and he was very supportive. So that go-around was relatively easy compared to 1988. Also by that time, I mean compared to the more recent. The 1988 was rather relatively smooth compared to what we went through with the recent revision [of] policies.

FISKE: O-oh.

CRESPI: But at that time in 1988 there were a number of anthropologists who wrote in supporting letters like [Richard W.] Rich Stoffle, [Robert T.] Bob Trotter, [Herbert H.] Hal Vreeland, a number of anthropologists came forward and very unambiguously supported the inclusion of ethnography in the policies and that was so important to me. SfAA, Benita Howell wrote supportive language and some of it I was also able to get incorporated into the planning chapter. That was a real high for me.

FISKE: Yeah. I can see why.

CRESPI: I was able to get language into the chapter on interpretation and there was a lot of negotiation with people who were in charge of their own chapters.

FISKE: Right.
CRESPI: And but it was working, it was very exciting. It was a very positive time for program building. It was really great.

FISKE: That’s great.

CRESPI: So, the right words got in. The internal team was being formed. So anthropology was being legitimized, legitimized in that policy document and we are responsible. The agencies got their policy say they are supposed to do ...

FISKE: Yeah.

CRESPI: Okay, so an identity was being created for anthropology. It was being institutionalized and legitimized. It was also getting more visibility in that in 1987 I did a Cultural Resources Bulletin.

Further Resources

The National Park Service prepared Legacy, Muriel “Miki” Crespi, National Park Service Chief Ethnographer, Her Professional Contributions to the National Park Service. This document provides a detailed review of many of her accomplishments in the NPS: http://www.nps.gov/ethnography/legacy.pdf.

The winter 2004 issue of Practicing Anthropology (26:1) edited by Gretchen Schafft is also relevant. It is entitled “A Life in the Practice of Anthropology: Muriel Crespi and the Development of the Ethnography Program in the National Parks” and includes a number of articles written by her work associates. Among Muriel’s publications is her “Ethnography and the NPS: A Growing Partnership” which appears in CRM Bulletin 10(1):1-4 (1987).
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Dána-Ain Davis works as an Associate Professor of Urban Studies Queens College and Anthropology at the Graduate Center at the City University of New York and focuses on the issues of marginalized people, particularly women and the impoverished. She received her PhD from the CUNY Graduate Center and previously worked at SUNY-Purchase as an Assistant Professor. She has published Battered Black Women and Welfare Reform, and co-edited two books, Black Genders and Sexuality (McGlotten and Davis, 2012) and Feminist Activist Ethnography (Craven and Davis 2013). The latter of these was the catalyst for this interview, on December 3, 2013 as part of a course in Anthropology and Contemporary World Problems at Northern Illinois University. Davis offered insight on what being an engaged anthropologist means, particularly within the context of her own work with gender and poverty issues. She also situates her work with the ideas of Low and Merry in “Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas” (2010) which defines both the expectations and the pitfalls of being an engaged anthropologist. Davis believes her subjects, and students have power and should be listeners of their own voice for change.

Could you tell us a little bit about how you first became an activist?

Dána-Ain Davis: Well, I think it actually started when I was a kid. My parents were active in the civil rights movement. I think probably by the time I was fifteen I was participating in reproductive justice movements for women’s reproductive health rights. And it was being a part of that movement that then propelled me into the feminist movement and working around issues to address the needs of battered women. So it’s been a long time.

In Low and Merry’s work, “Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas” they list seven forms of engaged anthropology: activism, collaboration, advocacy, social critique, teaching, public education, as well as sharing and support. What have you found that works best for you?

D-AD: Sharing and support. I would say that the different kinds of work that I’ve done, I’ve probably engaged in most of them. I’ve done public education as well. What I think is that each of those works differently in different circumstances, right?
So, collaboration works really well when you do work, maybe, with community groups. Advocacy seems to work really well, as you saw from my article, when you’re dealing with individuals with very specific needs. But you can also advocate for bigger issues. I would say all of those are linked, but one of those could come to the forefront at any one time.

Low and Merry also discuss barriers to engagement, such as the necessity to avoid politics and the expectation to remain neutral. What barriers have you faced in your activism?

D-AD: Well, one is that I have a problem being neutral. I have [had a problem] and I do [have a problem]. That’s what we’re [academics] supposed to be. The early guys who were creating social sciences said we’re supposed to be objective. And I’m not. I have passions about issues. I don’t know if that’s a barrier to my activism. It’s probably more of a barrier to me being an academic. But, I think, other barriers might be that sometimes, you know, you really know, or you really think you know what is the right way to go about a particular issue. If you’re working in collaboration with people you really have to honor the fact that they also have just as much right, legitimacy, and knowledge to help create, you know, whatever the issue’s going be and how it’s going be approached.

But I do think that a barrier to some, not all, some people who do this kind of work is that they think that they know best. Another barrier is that sometimes your subjects don’t want you to do certain things. You may have started doing an action or you may have started with people organizing and everybody was onboard. Maybe at some point they’re just like “you need to stop. You need to step back.” That also can be a barrier.

And then there’s another barrier that I don’t think we talk about a lot. It comes from funders; people who give money to groups that do activist work. They try to control a lot. Funders try to control a lot about what’s going to go on. And sometimes a funder can be a big barrier. They can be a barrier that you had not anticipated. So, those are the primary issues that I have experienced, especially, the funder problem, and the issue of people saying “step off, step back, or stop.”

Tell us more about that funder problem.

D-AD: The funder problem, okay. I was working, before I became an academic, I had a 9-5 job. (Now this is like 24 hours a day). I was working at an AIDS organization and, we had a peer education program. We were trying to figure out how, well we weren’t trying, we were figuring out how to use peer education around needle exchange. So, if you can imagine, that’s a hot button issue. People didn’t want to fund distributing clean needles, right? [Which we were doing] to decrease transmission [of HIV/AIDS]. That’s what we were doing. We had one funder tell us that if we didn’t stop doing the kind of organizing that we were around needle exchange, which is you
know is just one aspect of doing HIV/AIDS education, they told us they were going to pull their grant from us which was, I don’t know, 75 or 100 thousand dollars. That was a large amount of money.

I kind of thought that the board and the executive director were going be all right with that. Those of us who were doing the public education piece, the peer outreach, and were working with the needle exchange project, we were surprised when they didn’t [do what the funder asked]. They said, “Okay, so take your money.” My point is their request could have been a barrier to a really important issue. People still criticize needle exchange. [Some members of] the African American community thought that if needle exchange, [was a way] to give our youth, and our people, an opportunity to become addicts. It was a crazy moment. Politically and emotionally, and the funders didn’t really help.

In your book that you co-edited with Christa Craven, Feminist Activist Ethnography (2013) you wrote “Longstanding feminist concerns with inequality are undeniably intertwined with neoliberal policies and practices that reduce citizens’ relationship to the state to one based solely upon consumption of services.” Could you give some specific examples of this?

D-AD: First of all, I just want to say that sentence is too long. And so, we probably needed more grammar. You want specific examples of neoliberalism, specific examples of the whole thing?

About how the citizens’ relationship to the state becomes on consumption of services.

D-AD: Okay. I don’t know how many people here know about receiving public assistance. When I teach classes, often times, a lot of people do. I have also been on public assistance, by the way. What happened in 1996 was that welfare reform made it easier for a range of social services to be privatized. For example, instead of going to the Department of Social Services [in New York City] and getting job training from the Department of Social Services, they hired prison-related companies to do training for people that would ultimately need jobs. So that’s what I mean by privatization.

The idea is that people are supposed to be consumers. In this context of neoliberalism is that (and I’m going to try to make this simple) is that if you’re poor, or have low income, neoliberal ideas, neoliberal theory argues that if one get a job, no matter how much it pays, if only one gets a job and starts consuming the way the middle class consumes, if you start buying the kinds of things that the middle class buys or that elite people buy (not that we could ever get those things)—if you become a consumer, then you have redone yourself and you are on the way to not having a poor person’s mentality. That’s one way that it gets explained.

But to consume also supposedly means that you have choices. And neoliberal ideology, or neoliberal practice—the ideas about neoliberalism—is that you should in fact
be consuming, have choices that have been organized, often, by major companies. [The idea here is that] those are the best choices for you. So no, you shouldn’t barter with people to secure goods and services. You should be buying goods and services. And, where might you buy stuff? You at Wal-mart, or at Target. In other words, you should have access to the things that the corporate elite thinks are the best things for you to have, right?

So, the consumption piece is just about buying and putting more money into the hands of private companies. Those are the people who tend to control the stuff that most of us get, right? There are certain mom and pop stores and smaller businesses, but big business really controls a lot of what we get and how we get it. They undermine—you know, do you all have bodegas in the neighborhood, Mark?

No.

D-AD: Okay! Well, in New York we have lots of bodegas, little stores in the city. Little stores owned by individuals or maybe a family where you can just go get things from the corner store. Of course it costs more to go there, because they aren’t able to buy goods in bulk. If you go to Wal-mart they undercut everybody. They buy so many goods, that they benefit from better pricing. In fact, they also own so much that they control major industries. The point I was trying to make is that this idea of people being consumers comes from a belief that people should just really be in the market. If you’re doing, say hair braiding to make money, then you’re not in the market. If you’re babysitting to make money, then you’re not in the market. What people want is for you to be in the market buying things. Spending your money in places, being a consumer, and it is that practice and participation in the market that is supposedly going to be the thing that shifts people from being poor to not being poor. It hasn’t worked. Sorry, that was a long answer.

How can an average person engage in these issues and help resolve them?

D-AD: The issue of neoliberalism? Or issues of activism?

The issue of neoliberalism.

D-AD: This is going to sound really weird, but I actually think that part of problem of inequality that exists in our country has to do with, not only the fact that people make lots of money, but also that there is unequal access politics participation. I’ve been thinking about how people should organize around, for example, voter rights and redistricting. I think, in most states when they redistrict, electoral district boundaries are redrawn. There are different rules for various states, but it is sometimes a made by Commission, or the State Legislature, but in the end it is decision that you and I are not part of. I think who participates in redistricting should be rethought and more inclusive. In that way representation and issues might be more democratized.
A down-on-the-ground approach might include undermining neoliberalism, especially privatization wherever we can. So for example, who operates the school bookstore?

It’s the university.

D-AD: It’s the university. In New York City, Barnes and Noble operates the bookstores at most CUNY campuses. Many SUNY schools have Starbucks. At some points, students at some of the universities I’ve worked at have organized against corporate takeover of services. Corporations keep slipping into places that used to be run by colleges. And when we let that happen, that means we are then “forced” in to participating in a neoliberal plan. We need to organize around those issues. Students are some of the best organizers in the world.

So those are two different ways in which I think we can work against neoliberalism. One is at a really macro level around making changes in our political system. And another is really organizing against the things that we see. For example, when a big box store wants to come into a neighborhood people organize against that. And, in some places they haven’t been successful. I keep talking about Wal-mart but Wal-mart is one of those corporations that people organize against. Because they have a whole agenda that’s really about putting smaller stores that might be owned by any one of our family members or a place where our family members might work—putting them out of business. So those are two ways.

Can you explain more in depth how the dynamics between the person being researched and the researcher affect the study?

D-AD: Affects a study in general or affects mine?

Yours.

D-AD: Mine. Oh, okay. You know, first of all I have to say it’s a very special kind of relationship when you’re researching with battered women, right? So there are a lot of emotions that go on with it. If you’re a person who’s battered and you’re living in a shelter, that means you’re homeless. At least that’s how some battered women think of it. So the relationships were, both wonderful and full of tension. The wonderful part was these women, in some ways became friends. They used to call me at home, because I wasn’t living at the shelter—I couldn’t live at the shelter. They would call me and we would talk. Other times we ate out and chatted.

On the other hand, they also wanted things from me. And, the relationship changed depending on what their needs were. When everything was fine and all the planets were lined up and they were able to get their food stamps and weren’t being harassed by the Department of Social Services we would meet and we would just eat and talk about their future plans. When the Department of Social Services was telling
them that their food stamps were going to cut or that they were going to get less money from public assistance, they then wanted me to operate differently and be more of an advocate.

Being a researcher, I had to honor whatever space they were in, you know? Sometimes I may have wanted to do an interview with them about a particular topic and all they wanted to talk about was how the Department of Social Services was kicking their butt. Sometimes we were supposed to meet and do something in particular and they wouldn’t show up. And, what, I’m going to get mad at them? No.

Most people stay in the field doing research for at least one year. I remained in the field longer because it took me, 3 months to get anyone to talk to me. No one talked to me for the first 3 months. I just had to honor the fact, that you just come into the battered women’s shelter and immediately start collecting interviews. Women’s eyes were bruised, their faces were cut. Why would they want to talk to me? So I just had to hang in there and wait until they trusted me and then even after they trusted me, sometimes, it didn’t always work out the way I planned. The only other thing I’ll say is that sometimes people spoke different languages. There was one woman there who was from Bosnia; she didn’t speak English and I didn’t speak her language. That research relationship was very interesting because I actually understood everything she said. It was kind of weird—how we created a connection with each other even though we did not speak the same language. So that was interesting.

Those are just some of the tensions; people not wanting to talk to me. People wanted me to be different with them in different contexts. I might want to talk about or do one thing and they might say “Look, that’s not happening today.” And I would have to be patient, just like what one does when you are friends with someone. Just be patient, wait for people to come when they’re ready.

Cheryl Mwaria has explained that “black feminist anthropologists frequently live their anthropology and they often experience the inequities of race and gender,” has there been a research experience that has particularly hit close to home for you and how has it changed you?

D-AD: There were two. I haven’t lived the experience of being battered, but I have lived the experience of sexual assault. And, some of the women who were battered had also been sexually assaulted by their batterers. Sometimes it was hard to just have to relive that experience while they were talking. But it wasn’t about me. What it was about was being open and available to them.

And, it was, it is profound when you begin to think outside your own experience, right? And you realize that the world doesn’t revolve around you. You make connections with people because you understand. I’m not saying that you have to experience what people experience, because I do not think that is true. You do not have to experience what people experience to understand it. What you have to do is you have to be open. You have to be honest. And you can get what is happening for others. And if you have experienced something similar, you can’t let that experience, especially in
the research environment, overshadow what’s going on for the people that you’re doing research with. It cannot be about you.

*What are some projects you are currently working on to impact these issues of marginalized groups?*

**D-AD:** So, one issue that comes through, I hope, in the work is voice, right? People’s voices, so I’ve done a completely different project than the one I wrote about, which is called the African Burial Ground National Monument in New York. It is a space where, in the 1700s, there were thousands of bodies of formerly enslaved, or enslaved people, found in lower Manhattan. In 1991, the General Services Administration was digging to build a building. They were just going to raze over all of those bones. But people started organizing to help save those bones, which ultimately became a National Park Service site.

The recent past president of the American Anthropological Association, Leith Mullings and I did a research project for the National Park Service to capture some of the voices of the activists who had worked to save those bones and who fought with the federal government, and who fought with some New York City officials, to save the site as one of national and historical importance. So that’s one project I’ve worked on that is about turning up the volume of people’s voices and experiences that are often hidden or silenced.

I am about to go to Puerto Rico to do a small research project with women who are activists. In old San Juan there is an area called La Perla, which has been referred to as a ghetto. It is a very poor neighborhood. And, part of the piece of land on which it sits is owned by the National Park Service. The government wants to build a walkway right through, a walkway for tourists! So they can get to the ocean. They want people to be able to walk along the water and go through these people’s neighborhood! Some of the women, I found out, are organizing against this project. Oh surprise, surprise! So on one hand, it is to me, a little bit of a neoliberal approach to try to create a market for everything. They want to create a market, a tourist market, so people can walk through the area. I want to document what women are doing around this issue. That is the current thing I will be working on. We call that a rapid ethnographic assessment. It’s going to be fast. Quick!

*Our last question for you is, what do you consider to be your greatest success in your activism?*

**D-AD:** Wow. Can I just say my greatest success? Okay you know what? I’ll tell you what it is. I got it! I think the most amazing thing that has happened has been teaching students who have taken seriously how important it is not to just sit there and take information in and spit it back out. But to take information in, to think about what it means for them personally and for other people, and to know they don’t
have to just sit down and take stuff. To know that they can change things and they can participate in change.

I have received letters—I can’t even believe it, I’m about to cry -- I’ve gotten letters from students (not all of them, it’s not like I reach out and touch everybody) but I have received letters from some students who talk about what they have learned. I don’t think it was me so much, I think it was the class. The way Mark teaches your class, I’m sure, which is really engaging and you all work with him. I’ve gotten letters where former students have said that the class changed their mind about what they think they can do. And that to me is the most amazing thing. So there you have it.
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*The following is an interview with Josiah Heyman, Professor of Anthropology and Chair of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Texas in El Paso, conducted on November 26, 2013 as part of a course in Anthropology and Contemporary World Problems. This interview was inspired by his two articles, “An Academic in an Activist Coalition: Recognizing and Bridging Role Conflicts,” (2011) and “Engaging With the Immigration Human Rights Movement in a Besieged Border Region: What Do Applied Social Scientists Bring to the Policy Process?” (Heyman, Morales, and Núñez 2009). Josiah Heyman has done extensive research over the years on border and immigration issues between the U.S. and Mexico. He brings to the table his insights of the work that coalitions are doing to address border issues, providing a so-
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cial science and anthropological lens. He offers ideas and suggestions for effective policy change that starts from the ground-up.

You talk in one of your articles about how policy is made and how important it is to incorporate social science and anthropological approaches. Can you go into more detail about how these can be incorporated more to create policy?

**Heyman:** Immigration policy is made in one domain or one area and social science scholarship is made in another one. So the challenge is figuring out how to make a bridge between the two. They are not just automatically linked. Just because we know things and learn things over time does not mean that it really enters into the policy process. So an additional challenge is figuring out how to get information into the process, how do you connect to effective political movements, what kinds of information might be useful at what moment in formulating the policy, and so forth; so that they are not just automatically linked. Just because you do good scientific work does not mean that it has any effect on policy; so there is a specific challenge: how do you make that linkage?

You also discuss how immigration and terrorism have been linked into the same concept post 9/11. Have you seen any kind of shift in this mentality through your work?

**Heyman:** Yes, I think that 9/11 was really irrelevant to almost all immigration. The only connections have to do with visitors passing through international airports and with Muslim immigrants. It’s also important to remember that some acts of terrorism are domestic. So the vast majority of people, whether they are unauthorized migrants or completely legal migrants, and especially people coming through legally and without documents through the U.S.-Mexico border, have nothing to do with terrorism at the empirical level. I believe they got merged because terrorism is a powerful symbolic thing that becomes an easy way to convey fear and anxiety about change in the country. There is this notion that strange people are coming into the country and they must be the source of all dangerous things; so we are going to take something, which really has to do with airports in Miami, and we are going to put it onto the U.S.-Mexico border.

I think that a lot of the awareness of immigration issues in the last couple of years has shifted the debate back to immigration. I do not think we hear the kind of discussion of this in terms of terrorism quite as much as we did after 9/11. I actually take seriously issues of political terrorism and security. I think that people in civilian life should be as free as possible from the threat of political harm. I think that is a good principle to have across a lot of situations. But I do think that the real issues having to do with immigration policy and border policy are not really connected to that so we’re still sort of stuck. What we’re really stuck with this time is more of a concern about whether or not people are breaking the law, legality. I think the big debate in border
policy and immigration policy right now is the sanctity of the land border. It’s legality; and I would say that behind that, it’s prejudice against people from Mexico. I think there is a misapprehension in the general public that most immigrants are from Mexico, which is not actually all that accurate. It’s the single largest group, but it’s not most of the total. Also, there are actually more legal immigrants most of the time than unauthorized immigrants.

But I think lurking behind this concern about a perfect border and lurking behind this concern about legality is fear of demographic change, fear of social or cultural change with respect to all sorts of sources of immigration; but the strongest single concern is Mexico. This means that there is an important need to use good social science to inform the policy process having to do with: is it possible to make a difference by legalizing migration? What is the reality of the border, what are the harms created by illegalization of people crossing the border, and so forth. The challenge is getting a political movement. It’s not just enough for me to know a lot about migration at the border. It’s about being plugged into a political movement where that sort of information can be useful.

Another political struggle is focused on the national interior and has to do with legalization of unauthorized immigrants. At the same time, there is also a struggle to get a new more fair-minded, more human rights-respected border enforcement policy and not to have an even more massive build-up of police and military force at the border. So, getting down into the details of what’s proposed and coming up with new proposals is work that academic social scientists or practicing social scientists need to be better trained to do.

Many years ago I did ethnography with officers of what was then the Immigration and Naturalization Service (border patrol, port of entry inspectors, investigators, and so forth). Now, they’ve been included into different areas of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). What I’ve been working on recently is thinking about what I know about the perspectives of those officers, the work routines, the training, the organizational structure and culture; thinking about all of that stuff to try to figure out how to improve the way they conduct themselves, to reduce incidence of physical and verbal abuse, to limit use of force to those situations where it is really justified. In my original, academic work I was not trying to get down into the weeds of supervision. I was trained to make, very interesting I think, abstract theoretical generalizations; and I still love doing that stuff. I haven’t abandoned trying to be an imaginative, creative scholar. But something that I have learned that I need to do is figure out how to connect my knowledge to the details of how you actually do something. So what I then have to do is write up a document that has very specific bullet points that says “supervisors will be responsible for the following things,” and “training will address the following things” and so forth; and then somebody who’s on a congressional staff can turn that into actual legislation. But to be able to give them very specific, very concrete things that might lead to effective results in the real world is part of building that bridge between the scholarship and the policy world.
What is the level of engagement the borderland communities have in local and national immigration policy?

Heyman: I would say that there has long been organizations, activities, documentations, struggles, and so forth on the border. But I would say in the middle of the last decade, it really was not large or very consolidated. Starting around the beginning of the last decade, a new model of community organizing within border communities emerged. There are 8 million people on the U.S. side of the border, so it’s not just a place where people go through at night; there’s an enormous border population. People started organizing using community organizing methods and by the middle of the last decade, so say around 2006, we began to try to pull together a broad range of border sectors (business, faith-based communities, local law enforcement, local elected officials, academics, and community organizations of various kinds).

We have had large conferences that have tried to do two things: they tried to pull people together geographically from all along the U.S. side of the border. The other thing is to pull together a lot of different sectors. One sector that got pulled in was the academic sector. That’s how I got drawn in. People started to ask me, “what do you have, what is your knowledge and your skills?” One of the things I had was not only my academic knowledge, but also that I’m a good reader and a good writer. So I’ve taken two roles. I’ve used my knowledge to contribute to this and I’ve also used my writing skills to pull together a lot of scattered information. What that did was begin to create the possibility of having a strong voice that can be demonstrated to represent a lot of different people, a lot of different groups in the borderlands. And that in turn has given us a good deal of legitimacy dealing with people in Congress. People in Congress vary. They have their own attitudes, they have funders, they have constituents, and so forth. But they are definitely affected when they hear large groups of organized voices; they pay attention to that. Sometimes they’re responsive, sometimes they’re not.

In general, in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands the vast majority of people in Congress are liberal Democrats. It’s a heavily Mexican-origin constituency all along the border. El Paso is 83% Latino/a and so that means that our voice tends to be heard. So, having organization in the community, bringing together a lot of voices, coming up with new and creative ideas, and working with political allies has been a positive process of building an effective voice.

The limitation is that the border is still very marginalized nationally. Our problem is that we have this regional voice and we have this regional expertise but we’re facing a lot of people nationally who are not so connected yet have strong cultural frameworks, symbolic concerns, fears, emotions, and so forth. We’re starting to try now to identify some kinds of economic connections from the border to those sorts of interior districts and use that as leverage to make further progress in the political process.

That’s not my work though; I’m only part of the division of labor. So people who are working for organizations part-time or full-time politically have a role in the divi-
sion of labor. What I do is use their ideas, use their vision, but formulate it in ways we can put it into people’s hands and say, look, here’s a bunch of information, here’s a bunch of ideas. So, as an anthropologist or as a social scientist, I always have to see myself as only part of the division of labor. I am not accomplishing this thing all by myself. I don’t have time, I don’t have the energy, I don’t have the skills, I don’t have the connections. I’m effective when I’m humble and I’m part of the division of labor.

In your Mexican border report, you mention effective border policies. How do you go about establishing trust between law enforcement officials and the community when they’ve had a history?

Heyman: There are many different kinds of law enforcement and the biggest gap is between the federal law enforcement and the community because frankly, a lot of people in the community are involved in things like unauthorized migration that the federal law enforcement people are going after. Then there’s state law enforcement and unfortunately in Texas, state police are run from the outside. Then there are local police of various kinds. There is the city of El Paso police department, El Paso county sheriff, and small municipal police departments. In those cases we’ve had a fair amount of success at working with key decision makers and working with police departments. By working with police departments, they realize that what they want to do is to have trust and openness in the community. The community may be full of mixed status families and what we told the local police was, “Look, if you scare the community, they’re not going to cooperate with you and they’re not going to report violent situations or give you information.” So if they want to be effective, they need to stay out of federal immigration law enforcement. They need to make it clear to the community that they are not an arm of the DHS. They are there for community safety and community law enforcement, and the majority of law enforcement in this area has been responsive to that. But it’s a process of dialogue.
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At the SfAA Meeting in Albuquerque, we will have the 1st meeting of the new TIG on Business Anthropology. It will take place on Thursday, March 20th, at 3:30 pm. Gitti Jordan and I will host the meeting. Come and join us in ‘Alvarado D’ to meet other people doing or interested in doing business anthropology. We will talk about what we as a group would like to pursue in representing business anthropologists at SfAA and its larger world.

When you look at the Albuquerque program, you’ll see that business anthropology is well represented. Gitti and I have organized 3 sessions:

- Thursday, 10:00-11:50 am, panel, “Challenges of Collaboration: Intersection of Knowledges, Power and Emotion” (TH-37), Alvarado G
- Friday, 9:00 am -5:00 pm, all-day workshop, “Orientation to Business Anthropology (F-13), Fireplace
- Saturday, 12:00-1:50 pm, roundtable, “Big Data and Algorithms in the Age of Ethnography” (S-63), Alvarado C.

There are at least 4 other sessions organized by business anthropologists:

- Wednesday, 5:30-7:20 pm, “Coming of Age in the Corporate Context: Exploring the Non-Linear Transition from Student to Practitioner and Back Again” (W-157), Alvarado G
- Thursday, 1:30-3:30 pm, “Strategies of Organizational Research” (TH-96), Alvarado F
- Saturday, 1:30-3:20 pm, “Business Anthropology Roundtable: New Voices, New Destinations, New Futures” (S-103), Fireplace
- Saturday, 3:30-5:20 pm, “International Perspectives on Business and Market Research” (S-133), Fireplace.

See you in Albuquerque!
Growing a Group: Gender-Based Violence TIG Celebrates Its 7th Year

Jennifer R. Wies  
jenennifer.wies@eku.edu  
Eastern Kentucky University

Hillary J. Haldane  
hillary.haldane@quinnipiac.edu  
Quinnipiac University

The Gender-Based Violence Topical Interest Group formed in 2007, and we have had the privilege of organizing sessions at the annual Society for Applied Anthropology meetings around this issue for the past several years. The 2014 meetings will provide an unprecedented opportunity for gender-based violence scholars to share their research and network with each other.

As co-chairs of the TIG, we are simultaneously astonished and equally pleased at the growth of the TIG. From our humble beginnings, where Jan Brunson was the only member in attendance at our 2009 meeting, to 2013 with over 100 different members attended our sessions and TIG meeting, the GBV-TIG has strived to be a welcoming and inclusive group to foster collaborations, support, and friendship for students, practitioners, and teachers alike. The lineup for the 2014 panels devoted to understanding and ending gender-based violence is impressive and brings together the greatest range of topics and perspectives to date.

The two days of panels bring together case studies from China, Mexico, Malawi, Brazil, the United States, Afghanistan, Kenya, and Guatemala. Scholars are addressing such issues as refugee status, food security, trafficking, child abuse, abortion, medical and other health encounters, HIV, and courtroom dynamics, to provide just a sample of paper topics. This incredible range of issues and case studies demonstrates how far the study of gender-based violence in anthropology has come since the initial papers offered by Dorothy Counts and her colleagues at an Association of Social Anthropologists of Oceania meeting back in 1989. What is exciting from the standpoint of the TIG is how many new members are joining the panels and the institutions they represent. We have this year with us undergraduate and graduate students, as well as university faculty at the assistant, associate and full professor level. We have practitioners and NGO activists, and the institutions represented range from community colleges, and professional schools to research universities and liberal arts colleges.

In addition to the four formal sessions, the TIG has also organized a wrap-up session and a TIG meeting for members and interested conference attendees to meet up and network. We hope these sessions and opportunities for discussion will lead to collaborations and collegial relationships that allow our scholarship to have a wider reach.
Lastly, an additional session that may be of interest to TIG members and other scholars interested in gender-based violence is the panel devoted to an overlooked topic in the anthropological literature: martial rape. Gabriela Torres and Kersti Yllo are hosting a session entitled “Developing Cross Cultural Approach to the Study Sexual Violence in Marriage.” Based on work that developed during a Wenner-Gren sponsored symposium in May 2013, papers in this session explore the cultural, legal, and medical aspects of sexual violence that occurs within marital relationships. Hillary and I will be presenting our current work that situates rape in marriage within the gender-based violence literature.

We believe that the Albuquerque meetings will be a pivotal time for establishing agendas for the future of gender-based violence research in anthropology and the applied social sciences.

Tourism and Heritage TIG: SfAA Annual Meetings Preview

Melissa Stevens
melissa.stevens7@gmail.com
University of Maryland, College Park

Student Paper Competition

We are proud to announce the winners of the third annual Tourism and Heritage TIG Student Paper Competition! The competition started with the submission of paper abstracts this past fall, four of which were selected to be presented in a specially organized paper session in Albuquerque. The authors of the top paper will receive a cash award of $500 and will be honored at the Meetings.

The winners of the 2014 Tourism and Heritage TIG Student Paper Competition are:

- Sallie Dehler (Mississippi State University): Green Motives: Understanding the Relationship Between Tourism and Migration to Edges of National Parks in Costa Rica

- Olivia Sandri (Institut Universitaire Kurt Bösch, Switzerland): History, Memory, Heritage and Mourning: Touristification of Rome and Venice’s Former Jewish Ghettoes

- Brittany Hoback (University of Central Florida): Creating Islands in Hearts and Minds: Polynesian Performers Enacting Place through Cultural Tourism
And the top prize is awarded to:


Please join us in congratulating the winners and to hear their papers presented in Albuquerque in the session Exploring Future Destinations: The Winning Papers of the 2014 SfAA Tourism and Heritage TIG Student Paper Competition (WEDNESDAY, 1:30-3:20, Alvarado F).

The cash awards for the annual paper competitions have been generously donated by TIG members. In order for the competition to continue to support and celebrate future tourism and heritage scholars, a more permanent fund will need to be established. Please consider making a contribution to the TIG’s fund for the student paper competition. Your donation is tax-deductible and you will have directly provided support toward the continued growth and development of tourism and heritage scholarship. For details, please contact Tim Wallace (tmwallace@mindspring.com).

The 2015 competition will begin with the submission of paper abstracts in September. More details will be published here in the Tourism and Heritage TIG column in the May and August SfAA Newsletters. For more information on the competition, please contact Melissa Stevens (melissa.stevens7@gmail.com).

The SfAA Annual Meetings in Albuquerque

The theme of the 2014 Meetings is “Destinations,” and tourism and heritage related events are featured throughout the program. One of the highlighted sessions is Tourist Destinations as Nexus of Continuity and Change: Introductory Tourism Session (WEDNESDAY, 10:00-11:50, Alvarado E), organized by Susan Stonich and Sara Alexander. The session focuses on tourism destinations as points of contact and explores the relationships between tourism and environmental, social, and economic change.

The SfAA is also holding a special session honoring Valene Smith and her contributions to the anthropology of tourism on FRIDAY, 3:30-6:30pm, in Alvarado E. Dr. Smith’s groundbreaking book, Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism established the foundation for the study of this topic, and she will be presenting her paper “What We Have Learned from Hosts and Guests” at the session. The session will also feature speakers discussing Dr. Smith’s continuing impact on the field, and will be followed by a small reception.

One of Dr. Smith’s sustaining contributions is the Valene Smith Tourism Poster Competition, which is now in its eighth year. The competition is endowed through Dr. Smith’s generosity, and the award is given to support the research of future leaders in the field of tourism studies. The tourism posters will be displayed dur-
ing the general poster session (THURSDAY, 3:30-5:20, Alvarado E). Stop by to see cutting edge tourism research and to meet the students presenting their work.

The **Tourism and Heritage TIG meeting** will be held FRIDAY, 10:00-11:00, in the Presidential Suite. We invite everyone interested in the anthropology of tourism and heritage (including students) to join us as we discuss the annual student paper competition, plans for TIG involvement in next year’s SfAA meetings, and other tourism and heritage-related topics. We would love to have your input and ideas.

Other sessions of interest to tourism and heritage scholars include:

(T-32) TUESDAY 10:00-11:50
Alvarado B
**Museums, Collections, and New Mexico's Heritage**

(T-36) TUESDAY 10:00-11:50
Alvarado F
**Toward Sustainable Tourisms: Ecotourism and Recreational Tourism**

(T-42) TUESDAY 10:00-11:50
Turquoise
**Locating Heritage: People and Places of New Mexico**

(T-66) TUESDAY 12:00-1:20
Alvarado F
**Strategies for Tourism Development**

(T-103) TUESDAY 1:30-3:30
Fireplace
**Producing Heritage and Reconstructing Identities**

(T-133) TUESDAY 3:30-5:20
Fireplace
**Performing and Crafting Heritage and Destinations**

(W-13) WEDNESDAY 8:00-9:50
Fireplace
**Museums and Mobilities: Heritage In Place and Out of Place**

(W-33) WEDNESDAY 10:00-11:50
Alvarado C
**Engaging Participatory Visual and Digital Research, Part II: Heritage, Museums, and Community Building**
Looking to the Past, Negotiating the Present, Informing the Future: Student Destinations in Engagement with Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage

Multivocality and Cultural Heritage: Evaluating Current Practices and Perspectives

Intellectual Property Issues and Cultural Tourism: Developing Resources for Communities

Hosts and Guests: Tourism’s Consequences

Tourism in the History of Mexico and Guatemala

Tradition, Tourism, and Community in Sololá, Guatemala: Reports from the Ethnographic Field School of North Carolina State University

Tourism Sites & Field Schools as New Destinations for Public Engagement in Environmental & Cultural Sustainability, Part I: Latin America

Tourism Sites & Field Schools as New Destinations for Public Engagement in Environmental & Cultural Sustainability, Part 2: USA,
Canada, & Nepalese Himalaya

(S-11) SATURDAY 8:00-9:50
Weavers
Mobilities and Destinations: Variations on the Theme of Travel

(S-33) SATURDAY 10:00-11:50
Alvarado C
Heritage and Representation in Tourism Development

(S-67) SATURDAY 12:00-1:20
Alvarado G
Video: Nong Jia Le Peasant Family Happiness

(S-72) SATURDAY 12:00-1:20
Turquoise
Tourism Utopias and Dystopias (Roundtable)

* Please note that the event details listed here are from the Preliminary Program. Please consult the final version of the Program for any possible changes.

Future Columns Call for Papers

The Tourism and Heritage TIG would like to see your work published here! Please send us your travel and research stories, book and film reviews, or general tourism and heritage-related musings to Melissa Stevens (melissa.stevens7@gmail.com) for consideration for inclusion in future newsletter columns. Pieces should be no more than 1500-1750 words in length, including references. Please do not use endnotes or footnotes. Submissions for the May newsletter must be received by April 15, 2014.

Stay connected to the Tourism and Heritage TIG through:

Tourism TIG Listserv: to subscribe, contact Tim Wallace (tmwallace@mindspring.com) or Melissa Stevens (melissa.stevens7@gmail.com)

Human Rights and Social Justice Committee Update

Carla Pezzia
Carla.pezzia@gmail.com
HRSJ Committee Chair
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Meeting in Albuquerque

Each year there seems to be more and more panels and papers relevant to human rights and social justice work, indicating the importance of these issues to overall membership. This year is no exception, and it looks like it will be a great and thought-provoking meeting! Committee members and supporters have organized sessions on border issues, immigrant populations, disaster responses, human trafficking, and environmental justice, among many other topics. I also want to highlight a few roundtable discussions we will be holding.

We are continuing our yearly series on Emergent Issues in Human Rights and Social Justice (Saturday 1:30). This year we will be focusing on Fracking. We are also continuing our discussion on Socially Responsible Meetings (Saturday 10:00). We will provide an update on the Board’s decision of our proposal reviewed in November. Finally, we will be holding a roundtable discussion on the use of new media for HR/SJ work (Saturday 3:30). The purpose of this roundtable is to better understand the current and potential uses of multiple forms of media as a methodological and information dissemination tool. Our hope is that we will be able to determine interests and experience deficits to inform a skills building workshop for the following year.

We encourage everyone who is interested in HR/SJ work to attend the sessions and join us at our business meeting. Our meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 29, from 10-11am.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Human Rights Coalition

We are in conversation about affiliating with the AAAS Human Rights Coalition. Affiliation could bolster our advocacy efforts. You can find more information on the Coalition here: http://www.aaas.org/program/science-human-rights-coalition. If you have any comments on a potential affiliation with the AAAS, please send them to me as soon as possible to include in a request to the Board for consideration.

Final thoughts

Peter Van Arsdale’s term on the Committee has ended, and we would like to thank him for his commitment and dedication as an official member of the Committee. We look forward to his continued support as a friend and colleague of the Committee. Betsy Taylor has graciously taken over as the newsletter liaison. If you would like to contribute to the Committee column for the newsletter, please contact Betsy directly.
Student Corner

This issue brings us closer to the annual meetings in Albuquerque, NM. The theme this year, Destinations, can be interpreted in many ways. A destination can be a faraway place frequented by tourists, a completion of a goal or long-awaited journey, or a symbolic place where one feels a sense of being and belonging. Our two contributors come from different theoretical backgrounds and study in very different locales, but as their essays describe, the sense of destination has applications for a diverse set of anthropological methods and thoughts.

Nicky Belle is a Ph.D. student at Indiana University majoring in cultural anthropology and minoring in folklore. He works as Native American Programs Developer at the First Nations Educational and Cultural Center at IU and also works on Lakota language curriculum development through the American Indian Studies Research Institute. His academic interests include powwow dancing and singing, material culture, beadwork and feather work, and Native bling.

Christine Preble, Ph.D. Candidate at the University at Albany – SUNY, has studied cruise ship tourism between the U.S. and Caribbean since completing her Master’s thesis and short documentary film in 2008, North America’s Caribbean Cruise Vacation: The Globalized Authentic. She has since worked and lived in Mexico’s Yucatán Peninsula, completing her dissertation research on the island of Cozumel. Her dissertation is entitled “Consumption and Commodification: Cruise Ship Tourism and Cozumel, Mexico” and she plans to graduate from the University at Albany – SUNY in May 2014 with a Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology. In addition to tourism studies and the cruise ship industry, her other research interests include visual symbols and meaning, international education related to undergraduate study abroad, globalization and neoliberalism, and Latin American and Caribbean studies.

Curriculum Development at Red Cloud Indian School

Nicky Belle
Indiana University

During my third year as a Ph.D. student in anthropology, the American Indian Studies Research Institute (AISRI) at Indiana University was approached by members of Red Cloud Indian School to discuss the possibilities of co-authoring the first comprehensive K-12 Lakota language curriculum. While there existed many brands of well-intentioned textbook and countless attempts to develop the definitive approach to study and revitalize the language, no comprehensive curriculum had been successfully developed to that point.
In January 2008, I traveled along with the two co-directors of American Indian Studies and a fellow graduate student to Red Cloud Indian School in Pine Ridge, SD. During the week we spent there, we attended meeting after meeting, discussion after discussion with administrators, the school executive board, advancement team, teachers, students, community members, and an elder advisory council to discuss the needs, desires, and implications of an undertaking of this magnitude. It seemed that the same questions were being asked over and over—by students and teachers, parents and community members, in English and in Lakota: If so many attempts had been made in the past, how could we be sure it was going to work this time? Do people who don’t live on the reservation, people who didn’t grow up speaking Lakota have any right to be teaching it to the children? If Red Cloud produces the most successful Lakota language studies materials, will they in effect be the modern keepers of the language? Who can have ownership of something like language? How will the work we as a group put into this project compare to the worth of the resources that are being developed? How much is this going to cost us?

**Red Cloud Indian School**

Red Cloud Indian School, a private Catholic institution, sits approximately four miles north of Pine Ridge Village, close to the southern border of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota. The school, formerly Holy Rosary Mission, was established in 1888 at the behest of the historic Chief Red Cloud. Realizing that in order for his people and his descendants to have the opportunity to survive in a world that was becoming much more reliant upon and dominated by Euro-American influences, rules, and assistance, Chief Red Cloud petitioned Washington, D.C. to allow the Jesuits to establish a permanent home and educational presence on the reservation “so that [the Oglala children of Pine Ridge] may be as wise as the white man’s children.”

Holy Rosary Mission was renamed Red Cloud Indian School in 1969. At this point in the school’s history, administrators were moving to stress a stronger pairing of Catholic and Lakota education. One significant change was in the development of mandatory Lakota language and culture classes. For so many years, Indian children at mission and boarding schools were punished and belittled for practicing any of their traditional life ways, particularly ancestral language use. Speaking one’s native language is a strong marker of cultural identity, and it was decided that one of the quickest and most effective ways to destroy a person’s sense of self was to completely de-

---

value and disallow the practice of anything that made a person “Indian.” Hair was cut, traditional clothing was taken away and replaced with gray uniforms, and lye soap was used to burn the tongues of those children who bravely continued to speak their native language instead of English, as was being forced upon them (Philomine Lakota, personal communication 2010 and Rapid City Journal). The Jesuits saw the 1969 realignment of the school’s curriculum as an opportunity for atonement and a chance to once again be seen as a positive, desired presence on the reservation.

To this day, Red Cloud Indian School remains dedicated to enriching the lives of the children of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. “The mission of Red Cloud Indian School, a Catholic institution administered by the Jesuits and the Lakota people, is to develop and grow as a vibrant Church, through an education of the mind and spirit that promotes Lakota and Catholic values.” I learned during our initial meetings that although Lakota values and culture were being stressed across the current curriculum, and although Red Cloud prided itself on being a pioneer in Lakota language education, as they were the first school in South Dakota to create an established, required language component, no fluent speakers had been produced (Brave Heart, personal communication 2008).

There was no standard approach to teaching or testing the language, nor was there consistency in spelling or orthography. One year the students would learn their animals, numbers, and colors using one orthography, and the next they would have to relearn all the animals, numbers, and colors in a different writing system for a new teacher. It is extremely difficult to measure progress when progress isn’t being made. The language continued to be lost. By the time students got to high school, they were only required to take one year of the language. One hour per day over a four year period does not produce a competent speaker.

Year after year, nearly forty years to that point, had passed and the gap between modern youth and cultural heritage continued to grow increasingly wider. It is said that approximately 6,000 speakers of the language are left across the United States and Canada. The average age of those speakers: 65. The rate at which the language is being lost is far greater than the rate at which it is being learned.

Maȟpíya Lúta Lakȟól Waúŋspewičhakhiyapi

In 2008, the Red Cloud Indian School superintendent was Robert Brave Heart, Sr., a man who grew up on Pine Ridge, himself once a student at Red Cloud. He had “risen through the ranks” at Red Cloud, serving in many capacities as a school employee; bus driver and physical education teacher, religious studies teacher, department chair, high school principal, and finally superintendent. Feeling he was at a point where he would, in the not too distant future, be moving on from the post of superintendent, Robert made a list of the ways in which he could affect positive change before he left.

He felt he could best help Red Cloud fulfill its mission by proposing a project that would result in the development of the first comprehensive K-12 Lakota language curriculum. Beyond this, the ultimate goal was to produce scholars of the language, students who are able to speak, read, and write Lakota, and to achieve fluency in the language. While Red Cloud had worked with other entities in the past to help develop curricular materials, never before had such a structured plan for the development, testing, and finalizing of classroom materials, as well as a plan to secure funding for the entirety of the project, been established. They decided to name the project “Maȟpíya Lúta Lakhól Waúŋspewíčhakiyapi,” Teaching Lakota to Red Cloud Students.

After receiving a 1-year planning grant from the Grotto Foundation, a funding agency based in Minnesota who is known for their support of American Indian language programs, Robert and the team at Red Cloud set out to research approaches to second language acquisition, American Indian language and cultural revitalization projects, and possible partners for this new language project. They had met with many organizations—ones based on the reservation, off the reservation, and even ones based in foreign countries—to see who might be the most promising partner for this collaborative effort.

I was in my last year of coursework at Indiana when my advisor, Ray DeMallie, was contacted by a representative at Red Cloud. It was not an intention of mine to become a scholar of Lakota, however one main reason I chose Indiana University was because of its strong history in American Indian studies and because it is one of the few universities in the nation that offers an established course of study in Lakota language. My main area of research is powwow dancing, dance clothing, beadwork, and associated material culture. I wanted to be able to gain a basic working use of the language so that I could understand songs and translate historic texts and ledgers that deal with men’s societies and dance-related topics. Lakota language quickly became one of my strengths, if not one of my passions, at IU. After completing the four-semester cycle of Lakota, I enrolled in an independent study for which I spent the majority of the year translating historic Lakota texts into English, and I also served as teaching assistant for the subsequent semesters of Lakota.

During the planning meetings in January 2008, Robert shared with us that a key component of the partnership, which would commonly be called the Lakota Language Project, or LLP, was an on-site graduate student. This person would serve as a liaison between the staff at the American Indian Studies Research Institute—the linguists, historians, anthropologists, computer programmers, and curriculum writers—and the

---

4 http://www.grottofoundation.org/
5 At that time, the VP for Advancement at RCIS was also a graduate student at IUPUI and had, over the years, taken several courses from Dr. DeMallie in American Indian cultural and religious studies. This person passed his knowledge of AISRI, and the many successful current and past Native language curriculum development projects in which AISRI was involved, to Brave Heart and the planning committee.
6 http://www.indiana.edu/~aisri/about/index.html
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teachers, speakers, cultural consultants, and artists living on Pine Ridge. This role was the cornerstone of the partnership. It was the opportunity of a lifetime. As soon as that meeting was over, I called my wife back in Indiana to let her know I would be moving to South Dakota that summer.

**There’s the Door …**

Though I had spent what I felt to be significant amounts of time living and working with American Indian people, even two or three months at a time, it did not prepare me for life on Pine Ridge. Life is difficult there, and no matter how much a person reads about it or follows posts on Facebook, one cannot get a real understanding of the modern cultural climate until he or she becomes an “active” member of the community. So there I was, living in Pine Ridge, South Dakota. Alone. My wife, who at that time was four months pregnant, remained in Indiana to finish her doctoral coursework. As I said, this was an opportunity I could not pass up. When was the last time you heard of a white anthropologist being invited to an Indian reservation to become a working, functioning member of the community? That’s what I thought.

I could barely sleep before the first day of school. I woke up early. I wore a shirt with a collar. My title was Assistant Project Coordinator and I was ready to go! I decided to start off big and spent the first period in the largest Lakota language class that happened each day. This class was taught by the chair of the Lakota Studies department. I took notes feverishly—language use, classroom dynamics, assessment strategies, student ability and interest. I generated a huge list to discuss with the teacher during her prep hour that followed the class. The partnership was about to officially begin!

Me: “I really enjoyed the class! It was great to see how the students [did this] and [that]. Do you have some time to sit and talk about some ideas and go over some of this material now or would later be a better time?”

Teacher: “I’ve worked with people like you before. I know what you’re like. I really don’t want to help you. There’s the door…. You can leave now.”

I was not seen as a partner or a co-author. Even though I had been brought there by Red Cloud Indian School, was working for Red Cloud Indian School, and helping to create something that would be seen as the product of Red Cloud Indian School, I was not seen as a collaborator. I was the next white anthropologist, the next assimilator. The next in a line five hundred years long.

Beyond this, Red Cloud School is a Mecca for do-gooders. People from all over the world travel through Red Cloud conducting service projects, volunteering, donating backpacks and prom dresses, etc. And as quickly as they swooped in, most of them are gone. There is a very successful and popular volunteer teaching program at the school. The majority of the volunteers, though, are only on Pine Ridge for two years, three at the most. I was even told by one employee that if a teacher remained for more than four years, he or she would be considered a seasoned veteran. With such a rapid turnover, people saw it as unnecessary to allow themselves become emotionally involved
with coworkers, or to expect those people to be around for a long period of time... long enough to make a lasting difference, anyway.

Feedback Loop

The job was straightforward. Writers at AISRI would send me language lessons that were written in English or Lakota. I would bring this material, in the form of Word docs usually, to teachers and speakers who would then help to make sure everything was translated correctly, culturally relevant, and grammatically accurate. At the same time, I would provide local artists with lists of needed illustrations. I would then collect the correctly translated lessons and the corresponding artwork and send them along to Bloomington, where our designer would format the material into a usable textbook. This would then be printed out, placed into binders, and given to the students in the classrooms.

This served as another round of editing. Was the material teachable, did it all make sense, and was it ordered correctly? Based on the feedback we collect, we also create teacher manuals for each level. These include lesson plans, additional exercises, assessment tools (lesson quizzes, mid-term and final exams), and answer keys for everything. As new edits were collected, I was able to enter them into the electronic files and print out new pages for everyone’s binder. The feedback loop has continued this way since the start of the project. Edit, test, edit, test.

Difficulty arises, though, when a new teacher or speaker enters the mix. There are no “official” standards for writing the Lakota language. Each person’s interpretation is often different. Community to community, family to family, reservation to reservation, there are different ways of speaking. Too frequently it is the case that consultants disagree on what is the “right” way to translate a phrase or to spell a word. Unfortunately, the concept of “different, but ok” rarely exists. Most often, information is right or wrong, and wrong was so easily blamed on me and the history that I represent.

The idea of “partnership” proved to be the most problematic. Frequently, it was said that the overarching plan, or the underlying approach, or the framework of the project/collaboration was never really explained to the teachers. They were not involved with the initial grant proposal phase, nor was anyone else who wasn’t part of the administration, and because of this many felt left out from the start. Being excluded from the initial conversation regarding the necessity of a new standardized Lakota curriculum, teachers had difficulty understanding what their role in the project was supposed to be, and as a result felt very little ownership of the materials and were uninspired to be involved with further lesson development.

---

7 One teacher expressed that the reason he taught in a private school was so that he could be completely autonomy. “If I wanted to be told what books to use and lessons to teach and tests to give, I would’ve worked at [the public school]!”
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Doors to Opportunity

My tenure at Red Cloud Indian School lasted for three years. The majority of it was absolutely fantastic, and it really was the rare case that I was threatened with lawsuits for “raping my culture” or with physical violence. Those with whom I had difficulty in the past eventually became good friends of mine.

I was able to not only work with so many amazing, knowledgeable people on Pine Ridge, but I was also given the opportunity to travel around the United States to meet and work with many other reservation schools who were in the same situation that we were. Relationships were created that have helped me in my academic and personal life. Even after I left, I have continued working for Red Cloud, and I still get to travel to South Dakota for business and meetings. It also significantly increased my ability to use the language—in the classroom and on a daily basis.

Currently, Lakota language education is thriving at Red Cloud Indian School. Every student, kindergarten through senior in high school, is currently enrolled in a required Lakota language course—thirteen years of continued Lakota education being taught using the same sequenced books and being tested by the same standardized assessments.

The year after the LLP started, Red Cloud won the annual Lakota Language Consortium award for most improved school. And from that date, Red Cloud High School has won first place in the annual Lakota Nation Invitational Language Bowl and has also achieved the highest overall test scores in the LLC school testing. That means that on the standardized language test, Red Cloud scores the highest out of every Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota speaking school in the United States or Canada. This is a certain sign of progress.

The project’s impact, though, can only continue to be measured by its perpetuation. The ultimate sign of success in my opinion, many students from Red Cloud High School have expressed interest in attending Indiana University so that they may continue their language studies with those they have been working with for the last six years already. Seeing students enter the classroom unsure, yet eager to learn, and watching them grow and develop into confident, competent teachers and cultural resources helps us to realize the impact of the project.

---

8 http://www.lakhota.org/index.html
9 In the spring of each year, the Lakota Language Consortium administers a standardized test to every Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota speaking school in the US and Canada. The tests results are used to present annual awards to schools that are involved.
10 http://www.lakotanationinvitational.com/index.htm
Cruise Ship Tourism in Cozumel, Mexico: “Frios Como la Naturaleza de los Gringos lo Dice”

Christine Preble
University at Albany – SUNY

Cruise ship tourism is a dynamic site of inquiry within the anthropology of tourism. Its history and current social manifestations concern millions of localities around the globe that combine to form a transnational entity like no other. Billions of dollars and tourists’ bodies transverse oceans every year and the historical, social, and political processes that follow these flows of money and people are appropriately complex for ethnographic engagement. Applied anthropology, as a method and theory dedicated to problem solving, seems is ripe for the study of cruise ship tourism.

The localities where each cruise ships docks, referred by the industry as port-of-calls, are local communities with substantial stake in the economic prosperity of cruise ship tourism. Cozumel, a popular cruise ship port-of-call and island off Mexico’s eastern coast of the Yucatán Peninsula, welcomed nearly 1,000 cruise ships with an estimated three million cruise ship tourists disembarking in 2012-2013 (El Semanario Cozumel 2014:7). Cozumel is home to a unique blend of tourisms and tourists: from temporary cruise ship tourists who tour the island for a few hours each day while docked; all-inclusive, stay-over hotel guests; backpackers from the mainland; and those “running away from something,” in the form of longer-stay, expatriates, as an expatriate school director alluded to naming this group in one of our conversations (interview, 30 November 2011). All converge and blend in this thirty-mile-long island of approximately 100,000 permanent residents.

One particularly dynamic site of applied anthropological inquiry pertains to an economic climate of competition that exists in Cozumel. My work is centered on the argument that the U.S.-based cruise ship industry, formed by Carnival Corporation & PLC and Royal Caribbean International, forces such a climate upon locally owned and operated businesses, including their owners, operators, and employees. This climate is tangible among island residents working in the service sector: from timeshare salesperson at a highly rated all-inclusive resort to a non-Spanish speaking (who is fluent in only Maya) kiosk vendor selling souvenirs from a pushcart in Puerta Maya cruise ship terminal. The legalities surrounding each agreement between local business and cruise line is ripe for further study in questioning the industry’s motives and assessing local negotiation. Yet, as applied anthropology searches for answers to help the local population, we must agree the forces behind such economic processes are transnational conglomerations, corporate entities who operate beyond U.S. legislation and therefore beyond the law in most cases. Furthermore, cruise ship tourists seem to
revel in the current schemata: balloon hats and yard-long margarita cups, inappropriately lewd tee shirts for sale, 1970s disco blaring while dining on $11 guacamole just steps from where their ship is anchored for the day. As cultural anthropologists, we must therefore ask, what can applied anthropology lend to such a discussion, analyzing a constructed space as cruise ship tourism port-of-calls, especially in terms of socio-economic ecology?

Cozumel as a Constructed Space

Vendors, restaurateurs, hotel workers, timeshare sellers, and tour operators all work extremely hard to produce an experience for each tourist they encounter. For example, there is a new-wave Maya spiritualist from Mexico City, working as part-shaman, part-tour guide for a sweat lodge tour for cruise ship and stay-over tourists, to a native New Jerseyian, working to establish herself as a private chef and food tour guide. Each local Cozumeleno is focused on providing a service that stands out from the rest of the competition. Competition comes from other tourism destinations in the Riviera Maya, the Caribbean, and Mexico; from pre-booked shore excursions offered upon ticket purchase as well as onboard each of the cruise ships; and among other local businesses as positive reviews and rankings in locally produced marketing publications or online travel sites, like Trip Advisor, are prized commodities.

International tourists staying for longer-term vacations (as opposed to the daily arrival and departure of cruise ship tourists) and the expatriate community on the island are also dynamic forces. These populations are important contributors to the pulse of the local community. Working, either in tourism or not, along with community outreach or volunteering is commonplace. Facebook groups and email listservs provide opportunities for these populations to become entrenched in local life and establish a voice and identity of their own on the island. Beach clean ups, charity dinners, pet adoptions, and specific details of larger island-wide events (e.g. February’s annual carnival celebration or the Iron Man triathlon) are regularly transmitted and shared community information.

While such communities and activities are vibrant and widespread, the physicality of space on the island is divided. A mere two blocks heading eastward, away from the busy main tourist artery of Melgar Avenue where each of the three cruise ship docks are located, you are suddenly transported into a different landscape. This is the majority of San Miguel, Cozumel’s most populated main city on the island, where there are no U.S.-owned shopping or dining choices like Margaritaville, Hooters, Starbucks, or Harley Davidson. Locally owned and operated dive shops, car, bike, and scooter rental companies, regional and local construction and remodeling stores, hair and nail salons, and comidas economicas, are interspersed with private residences.

This description is not intended to label the non-cruise ship tourist zone of the island as “authentic” Mexico, as that romanticized notion is a false social construct and debates over authenticity in tourism studies have aptly waned in recent years (see Leite and Graburn 2009 for a concise description of the debate). Rather, its description
is to highlight the ways in which these two environments, the cruise ship tourist zone of Melgar Avenue and basically everywhere else on the island two blocks east, converge daily through the lens of tourism but in very segmented ways. Above all, tourists mainly operate in the structured confines of the tourist zone as manufactured by the cruise ship industry. Specially, such constructed spaces are the three cruise ship piers, terminals, and associated retail and dining centers on the island: Punta Langosta, International Cruise Terminal, and Puerta Maya, each located on Melgar Avenue. These piers are physical manifestations of boundaries intended to satisfy cruise ship tourist’s desires of an accessible and identifiable experience on land while keeping profits during cruise ship tourists’ disembarkation in the hands of the cruise ship industry.

**Royal Village: The Mall as a new Tourist Borderzone**

On Tuesday, January 14, 2014, six cruise ships are docked in Cozumel carrying 14,282 cruise ship tourists. International Cruise Terminal, a pier owned by Carnival Corporation to dock their fleet of ships, has two of its ships docked: the Carnival Paradise and Celebrity Solstice. The scene around this pier is similar to a frantic beehive: cruise ship tourists climbing in and out of taxis, local tour guides yelling for tourists to choose their excursion, crossing guards blowing their whistles and motioning for the next amassing of cruise ship tourists to safely cross the congested two-lane street. Yet even before these cruise ship tourists set foot on pavement, they must first make their way off of the ship, which is an exhausting trek in and of itself. As one tourist proclaimed, “It was like a maze trying to get off the ship!” (interview, 14 January 2014). International Cruise Terminal, along with the immediate cruise ship piers of both Punta Langosta and Puerta Maya, house a labyrinth of indoor shopping with seemingly thousands of vendors calling attention to their wares, tour services, and restaurants. At International Cruise Terminal, they will wake their way through the pier, emerging into the outside air, to finally cross the gate and take their first steps on the island.

Welcoming them across the street from the cruise terminal and pier is *Royal Village*, a newly constructed “shopping center” that was first erected in January 2012 and opened August 2012. This center was constructed through an agreement with the island’s government and the cruise ship industry (interview, August 2012). Two years later after its initial inception, the mall is not filled to capacity with stores, vendors, or restaurants. A 15-foot structure of a guitar looms above the mall, advertising Hard Rock Café, yet there is not such a restaurant on the grounds. Rather than a bustling zone of tourist activity, as depicted in its promotional renderings as displayed on giant posters throughout the complex, today, even with over 14,000 cruise ship tourists docked mere feet away, *Royal Village* is nearly deserted. Soft music and a warm breeze off the ocean fill the space where tourists do not.

This purposefully designed and erected physical space for cruise ship tourists confronts Edward Bruner’s theory of touristic borderzones (2005). Bruner defines touris-
tic borderzones as environments in the tourism landscape where guest and host rarely share other than to “coexist in a specially constructed locality, a performance space” (Bruner 2005:25). Spaces created by the cruise ship industry are a “specially constructed locality” yet not necessarily built for performance rather such specifically segmented spaces in the scope of cruise ship tourism are built for sale. Further, this space is specifically calculated and intentionally manipulated for a specific type of sale, intended to profit the multinational corporations or the few locally owned businesses in agreement with the U.S.-based cruise ship industry—not for the majority of the island.

In cruise ship tourism borderzones, performance is practically a non-entity as shopping centers, easily identifiable and familiar to cruise ship tourists mainly hailing from the U.S., Canada, and Western Europe, have replaced displays of indigeneity. Although small groups of mariachis or “Maya Warriors” (local young men and women dressed as stereotypical representations of indigenous Maya, Aztec, or Inca) perform for tourist dollars are both common examples of performance at each of Cozumel’s three cruise ship piers. Such borderzones more glaringly entice cruise ship tourists to spend their money in such retail spaces that are purposefully designed to shield profits from the majority of island residents. In a recently published newspaper article, one Cozumenleño writes,

Existe la apreciación de que las empresa de cruceros, usan el Puerto de Cozumel para hacerse de dinero y no están siendo corresponsables con los habitantes de esta isla. Los tres muelles de cruceros que hay en Cozumel ... deben darle más a Cozumel. Es cierto son buenos aliados, pero creo que se aprovechan de sentirse indispensables para nuestra economía, creo llegó el momento de adoptar otra actitud y posición frente a las navieras y veamos porqué. Si somos socios, nosotros le damos el mar y las bellezas de la isla, seguridad y recoja de basura para sus pasajeros y ellos, ¿Qué le dan a Cozumel? ¿Solo traen sus barcos?... Pero además, que obra o acción social, o donación le conocemos a esos tres muelles. Ninguna y no vemos que este en su proyecto construir algún parque, campo deportivo o donar alguna obra para beneficio de la gente de Cozumel ... son duros, son injustos, insensibles, frios como la naturaleza de los gringos lo dice. A la Carnival, al muelle SSA internacional [International Cruise Terminal] y la muelle de Punta Langosta, hay que exigirles más, que colaboren, que aporten, que ayuden más al pueblo (El Semanario Cozumel 2014:18).”

“‘There is an appreciation for the cruise ship industry, they use the Port of Cozumel to make money and are not being responsible with the inhabitants of this island. The three cruise ship piers in Cozumel ... they should give more to Cozumel. It is true they are good allies, but I think they take advantage of being indispensable to our economy, I think the time [has] arrived to adopt a different attitude and position on shipping and we see why. If we are partners, we give you the sea and the beauty of the island, security and collect garbage for the passengers and them? What do they give Cozumel? They only bring their boats?... But moreover, what work or social action, or donation do we know of at those three piers? Not one and we do not see this in your project to build any park, sports field or donating some work for the benefit of the people of Cozumel ... they [the cruise ship industry] are tough, they
As demonstrated in this powerful statement, the cruise ship industry is not giving back to the local population as they continue to reap millions of dollars of money generated from cruise ship tourism. The relationship between the U.S.-based cruise ship industry and Cozumel is unequivocally unequal.

**Authoritative Power and Cruise Ship Tourism**

A tension exists in Cozumel between locally owned and operated businesses, island residents, and cruise ship conglomerates’ expectations for economic success on land. It is the cruise ship industry that ultimately prevails as the island’s premier source, the center of authoritative power, of tourism to Cozumel. Max Weber (1947) defines authoritative power as power that is legitimated, conforming to the law and rules, and therefore accepted by society as authority. The massive earnings reaped from cruise ship tourism at the industry level (specifically by the U.S.-based cruise ship industry) in Cozumel are used to maintain legitimacy through the continued maintenance and establishment of new centers of commerce (e.g. Park Royal). Such practices therefore can be seen as tools to promulgate authoritative power as the industry works both within the framework of local government, in terms of construction agreements, as well as building to accommodate tourist expectations of the familiar (i.e. Urry’s tourist gaze, 1990).

A further example how the cruise ship industry establishes itself as an authoritative power is seen through its ability to work beyond the confines of law. U.S.-based cruise ship industry operates autonomous from U.S. law, as many cruise lines are registered in countries other than the U.S. (e.g. Liberia, the Bahamas, Panama, et cetera), and therefore are not accountable to U.S. regulation, environmental and labor laws, or corporate taxation. Non-U.S. flag registries, commonly referred to in the industry as “flags-of-convenience,” dominate because

U.S. laws are generally the most restrictive of all maritime nations. Convenience registry critics feel that cruise lines choose developing nations’ registries because as flag states, these nations are not only reluctant to discipline major contributors to their economies, but also do not have the resources to enforce regulations or even punish polluters [Gupta et.al. 2012: 276; see also Wright 2007].

As the aforementioned newspaper article attests and as Weber theorizes, “authoritative capitalism remains and trumps supreme hegemony over local community” (Weber 1947:327). Although this sentiment is exemplified throughout cruise ship
port-of-call communities in the Caribbean, this is the piece of the puzzle where applied anthropology can be employed as nuance, dynamism, and mobility shape most constructs of social consciousness.

Conclusions

It is imperative to note that there are degrees of agency among the local community of Cozumel, as power, even authoritative in nature, is not completely hegemonic. As Foucault asserts, “Power must be analyzed as something which circulates…. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth” (Foucault 1977:98). Individual and collective agency, concepts that Sherry Ortner (2006) uses to critique the way Bourdieu (1977) and Sahlins (1981) have omitted both (individual and collective agency) from their descriptions of power is useful in describing cruise ship tourism. Ortner describes agency as not merely a form of Western individualism but a shifting force embedded within cultural construction. It is the focus of this research and perhaps a call to applied anthropology to expand Ortner’s conception of the way agency is “shaped, nourished or stunted” under different regimes of power (Ortner 2006:137). Focusing on the social construct of power in terms of regimes, whether they are multinational, political, or social in nature, is extremely useful when analyzing tourism borderzones. Moreover, this line of thinking works in thinking how applied work can answer community questions on how to best “support, collaborate, and help” the local population of Cozumel under the theoretical guise of authoritative power.
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COPAA Events in Albuquerque
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As readers of this newsletter know, our annual Society for Applied Anthropology meeting is coming up in mid-March in Albuquerque. As has been the case in past SfAAs, COPAA has sponsored several sessions, to which we would like to call your attention.

On Wednesday, March 19 from 8:00-9:50 am, we are sponsoring a session called, “The Integration of Classic and Contemporary Anthropology in the 21st Century: Exploring Program Destinations in Educating Anthropologists.” The session was organized by Toni Copeland and Sherylyn Briller and they, along with additional panelist Jeremy Spoon, will discuss the curricular challenges involved in training our students for a 21st century job market.

On Thursday, March 20 from 12:00-1:20 pm, our out-going student representative, David Colon-Cabrera, has organized what promises to be a stimulating discussion for our graduate students (and perhaps even for our undergrads) entitled, “Wisdom I Didn’t Have: Advice from Practicing and Applied Anthropologists for Students.” Participating in the panel are Amanda Mason, Mary Odell Butler and Timothy Benner.

And, on Saturday morning from 8:00-9:50 am, Linda Bennett, Keri Brondo and Sunil Khanna have organized a session entitled, “Evaluating the Effectiveness of COPAA and CoPAPIA Tenure and Promotion Initiatives on Applied, Practicing, Engaged and Public Anthropology.” For all of us facing tenure and promotion issues in our own institutions, and who consider our work as falling into those categories, this will be an invaluable conversation on how to best position our dossiers in our institutional settings, and how to argue for greater recognition of the kind of work we do.

Three other sessions that are not sponsored by COPAA but that might be of interest to COPAA members and fellow travelers are:

“Promoting Transdisciplinarity: Linking Anthropology and Engineering on Community Projects,” organized and chaired by Riall Nolan and meeting on Wednesday morning from 8:00-9:00;

“Emerging Questions in Practice: Reflections on Where We Seem to be Headed,” which will be an open discussion facilitated by Riall Nolan and Elizabeth Briody;


Also, please note that on Friday, there will be an all-day workshop entitled, “Orientation to Business Anthropology,” organized by Elizabeth Briody, Natalie Hanson, Maryann McCabe, Inga Treitler, and Christina Wasson, which requires pre-enrollment and has a fee of $95.

All in all, we have an exciting roster of events to look forward to. We look forward to seeing everyone at our sessions and at the conference!

From the Editor

Jason L. Simms
jlsimms@gmail.com
Editor
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As I mentioned when I assumed editorship of SfAA News last year, several changes were planned. The first—and most noticeable—of these was the design change. This issue marks a further transition that I hope will transform this publication into a more useful source of information about SfAA, its members, and their associated activities.

First, Lance Arney has graciously taken on the role of Advisory Editor. Lance completed his Ph.D. in Applied Anthropology at the University of South Florida, and he continues to work there as Associate Director for the Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships. Lance will work with me to solicit content and, most crucially, to organize the layout of each issue. His invaluable efforts over the last few issues have been a primary reason that they look great and are delivered in a timely manner.

Second, the role of the Editor is evolving. Though the Board is still considering various options, what is clear is that the Editor will use SfAA News in part to provide coverage of Board meetings, offering background and summaries of decisions and agenda items. Though all Board meetings are open, members rarely attend, so this may provide some helpful insight and added transparency into the governance of our society.
Third, the publication schedule is shifting. Currently, *SfAA News* is published four times per year (Feb., May, Aug., and Nov.). This will change to three times per year (Feb., June, and Oct.). There are a few reasons for this. One, content for the August issue has always been a challenge, with many faculty and students away doing fieldwork, catching up on writing, or simply taking a much-needed break! Two, many members expressed interest in publishing an issue just before the AAA meetings, much as we do in February prior to the SfAA meetings. Third, we hope to publish more content online first as we receive it, making our news flow in a more continuous manner, easily readable via RSS online or on mobile devices, and easily shareable to social media and other outlets.

Stay tuned for more announcements and information. As we move towards our annual meeting in Albuquerque, I hope to speak with many of you there about these and other changes. Please share your thoughts and ideas with me and Lance, and safe travels!